

Optimal quantum mixing for slowly evolving sequences of Markov chains

Davide Orsucci,^{1,*} Hans J. Briegel,^{1,2,†} and Vedran Dunjko^{1,3,‡}

¹*Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Innsbruck, Technikerstraße 21a, 6020 Innsbruck, Austria*

²*Department of Philosophy, University of Konstanz, Fach 17, 78457 Konstanz, Germany*

³*Max-Planck-Institut für Quantenoptik, Hans-Kopfermann-Str. 1, 85748 Garching, Germany*

In this work we consider the problem of preparation of the stationary distribution of irreducible, time-reversible Markov chains, which is a fundamental task in algorithmic Markov chain theory. For the classical setting, this task has a complexity lower bound of $\Omega(\delta^{-1})$, where δ is the spectral gap of the Markov chain, and other dependencies contribute only logarithmically. In the quantum case, the conjectured complexity is $O(\sqrt{\delta^{-1}})$, with other dependencies contributing only logarithmically. However, this bound has only been achieved for a few special classes of Markov chains. In this work, we provide a method for the sequential preparation of stationary distributions for sequences of time-reversible N -state Markov chains, akin to the setting of simulated annealing methods. The complexity of preparation we achieve is $O(\sqrt{\delta^{-1}} \sqrt[4]{N})$, neglecting logarithmic factors. While this result falls short of the conjectured optimal time, it provides a quadratic improvement over naïve approaches. Moreover, for the case when the output distributions are required to be encoded in pure quantum states we identify the settings where our algorithm is strictly optimal. The settings of slowly evolving sequences of Markov chains naturally appear in reinforcement learning, and consequently our results can be readily applied in quantum machine learning as well.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum walks are the quantum counterpart of classical random walks and, correspondingly, many classical algorithms which are based upon classical random walks naturally lend themselves to be quantized. This quantization, either in the form of *coined quantum walks* [1–4] or using the so called *Szegedy walk operator* [5], allows to exploit coherence and entanglement to speed-up many computational tasks, with improvements with respect to classical algorithms that are typically quadratic or, in some special circumstances, exponential [6, 7]. Henceforth quantum walks have been employed in a variety of quantum algorithms with applications ranging from statistical physics [8, 9], to combinatorial optimization problems [10], to machine learning [11].

The primary motivation for the question we study in this work is the theory of quantum walks originated from their applicability to quantum machine learning, as demonstrated by the results of [11]. Therein it was shown that it is possible to achieve quadratic speed-ups in the *deliberation time* of a learning agent by exploitation of *Szegedy quantum walks* in conjunction with *amplitude amplification*. However, together with the certifiable speed-ups, quantum algorithms usually come together with a plethora of caveats and constraints that can impair their general applicability. In particular, the problem that spurred the present investigation is the following: the algorithm presented in [11] required that a quantum state encoding the *stationary distribution* is provided at the beginning of the algorithm. While the original paper showed how this assumption can be justified under certain assumptions on the nature of the learning algorithm, the question of other scenarios which provide means to generate such initial states efficiently remained open. We address here this question and resolve it in the context of *slowly evolving* Markov chains¹ (MCs). Slowly evolving MCs are natural in learning scenarios, but also in certain computational settings. For concreteness we will specifically consider their application to *Projective Simulation*.

More in detail, the problem we will consider in this work is that of sequentially generating quantum or classical samples from the *stationary distributions* of a sequence of slowly evolving MCs. Classical sampling corresponds to producing a single element according to the specified probability distribution, while quantum sampling to producing a quantum state which is a *coherent encoding* of the entire probability distribution; namely, producing a state of the form $|\pi\rangle \equiv \sum_x \sqrt{\pi(x)} |x\rangle$, where $\pi(x)$ is the probability of sampling an element x . This is schematically illustrated in Fig. 1. This setting is similar to the scenario of *simulated*

* davide.orsucci@uibk.ac.at

† hans.briegel@uibk.ac.at

‡ vedran.dunjko@uibk.ac.at

¹ Formally, a Markov chain is specified by a transition probability matrix and by an initial probability distribution. However, in the following we will subsume the specification of the initial probability distribution and simply identify the Markov chain with the transition probability matrix P .




FIG. 1. Schematic depiction of a sequence of slowly evolving MCs. In the top part (a,b), classical sampling problems are represented; in the bottom part (c,d), the corresponding quantum sampling problems, whereby the outputs are coherent encodings of probability distributions. In the left part (a,c), finite length sequences are considered, where the goal is to produce a (classical or quantum) samples from the last MC; in the right part (b,d), we depict two adjacent MCs within a sequence of arbitrary (or unbounded) length, whereby the goal is to sequentially produce a (classical or quantum) sample from each one of the MCs in the sequence. Case (a) represents classical simulated annealing settings. Note that here the intermediate samples $\tilde{\pi}_t$ need not be exactly the stationary distribution of MC_t . For example, they could represent a sample obtained after a few applications of the MC, before $\tilde{\pi}_t$ has converged to the stationary distribution π_t of MC_t . It is only required that sample from the last Markov chain MC_T is (approximately) distributed as the stationary distribution $\pi_T \equiv \pi_{out}$. Case (b) arises, for instance, in a classical reinforcement learning setting. Each MC_t represents the internal configuration of a learning agent after the t -th interaction round with the environment and the samples from π_t constitute the output of the learning agent to the environment at time step t . Being the samples classical they can be copied and provided also as input to the next MC in the sequence, in which case we would have $\tilde{\pi}_t = \pi_t$. Case (c) is essentially the setting considered in [12, 13] of quantum algorithms for speed-up of simulated annealing methods. Finally, case (d) is the one we examine in this paper, which arises, for instance, in the context of quantum algorithms for speed-up of learning agents, as done in [11]. Here the no-cloning theorem poses a hurdle, since it prevents from directly using the quantum state $|\pi_t\rangle$ provided as global output also as input for the MC at time step $t+1$. We will show in this paper how to exploit Szegedy quantum walk to overcome this hurdle.

annealing, in which case quantum improvements have already been achieved [10, 12, 13]. There is, however, a key distinction between the annealing settings and ours: in annealing settings, the target is to produce a sample from the stationary distribution of the final chain only, whereas the intermediary chains have only an accessory role. In contrast, in our case, we must produce samples sequentially, for each MC in the sequence; indeed, in principle the sequence can be infinite, or at least of a not a priori specified length.

The main idea we introduce for solving this sequential sampling problem is as follows. We first consider two classes of discrete probability distributions, characterized by their distance from the uniform distribution, and any given distribution will belong to one of these two classes. Within both classes the fidelity with a reference probability distribution will be at least $1/\sqrt[4]{N}$, allowing for sampling with a N dependence in runtime no worse than $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt[4]{N})$. The methods used for sampling differ for the two classes, and the second technique (employed when the target distribution is, in a sense we specify later, *far* from the uniform distribution) requires additional information about the underlying Markov chain. While this additional information cannot be straightforwardly recovered given just one MC, we show that in the context of slowly evolving Markov chains, it can. Moreover, we show that our algorithm for quantum sampling is essentially optimal: all quantum algorithms that aim to produce a coherent encoding of probability distributions require $\Omega(\sqrt[4]{N})$ steps, for a worst case choice of the probability distribution.

The structure of this paper is as follows. In the rest of the introduction we motivate the present work in connection to reinforcement learning settings and combinatorial optimization problems. In Section II we establish the notation, review the necessary background material on Markov chains and quantum walks, and introduce some MC-based quantum algorithms. In Section III we introduce the main algorithms that solve the problem of efficiently re-preparing coherent encodings of stationary distributions, analysing both the case

where only classical memory is used between successive time steps and the case where also quantum memory is allowed. Following this, in Section IV we consider variations of the main algorithms, whereby the task is to sample from stationary distributions restricted to a subset of marked elements. Finally in Section V we analyse the optimality of our algorithms, followed by a brief discussion in Section VI.

A. Application to Projective Simulation

Projective Simulation (PS) is a framework for the design of learning agents which can also learn in reinforcement learning [14] scenarios [11, 15–17]. The central element of PS agents is a specific type of a memory system, called the Episodic and Compositional Memory (ECM), which is a stochastic network of the experiences of the agent, the so-called clips. In the PS model, the deliberation process of the agent (the process which specifies which action the agent outputs in a given situation) is realized by a stochastic walk over this network. The learning, which is based on environmental feed-back, is manifest in the modifications of the network, which then smoothly modulate the output distributions. In the case of reflective Projective Simulation (rPS) this internal information processing corresponds to a time-reversible Markov chain (P). In the ECM some elements have a special role: the ones that correspond to the set \mathcal{A} of *actions*, that the agent can execute in an environment. In the rPS variant of the PS model, the output distribution of the agent is specified by the stationary probability distribution (π) of the Markov chain P . More specifically, since the support of the distribution π in general comprises both action and non-action clips, the actual desired output is the conditional distribution $\pi^{\mathcal{A}}$, obtained by post-selecting on the action states alone. As the ECM of the agent is gradually altered from time-step to time-step so is the resulting Markov chain P , and therefore the overall scenario matches the setting of sequences of slowly evolving Markov chains. In many cases the total number of states (N) in the ECM is large, and also much larger than total number of actions (M), typically $N \gg M \gg 1$. Thus we would like the runtime of this sampling algorithm to have dependence on N as low as possible, *e.g.*, logarithmic or poly-logarithmic.

A standard method to perform this sampling task is to employ Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) with rejection sampling². That is, we perform a random walk on the ECM according to the transition probabilities P ; the length of the random walk has to be at least as long as the *mixing time*³ of P in order to obtain a sample which is approximately distributed as π . If we have obtained an element of the action set we accept and output it; if we have obtained a non-action, we reject and start a new random walk of the same length as before (in order to find another unbiased sample); we repeat until we accept. The expected total runtime of MCMC with rejection sampling, measured in number of accesses to P (that is, the total number of walk steps), is given by the product of the mixing time and the sampling time, the latter being the average number of repetitions needed to first encounter an action state when sampling from the stationary distribution of P .

Quantum approaches to speed-up deliberation of rPS agents have been studied in [11], where, in a nut-shell, it was shown how to solving the same sampling task and having a runtime which is quadratically faster both in the mixing time and in the sampling time, using quantum techniques. To run the presented quantum algorithm it was assumed that one copy of the initial quantum state $|\pi\rangle$ encoding the stationary distribution π is available, and it was demonstrated how this can be assumed in a few situations, which somewhat limit the type of learning rules one wants to utilize. In general, however, the cost of preparation of $|\pi\rangle$ may be prohibitively high. For instance, using a naive method of preparing $|\pi\rangle$ by applying the corresponding projective measurement (this is possible using the Szegedy quantum walk operator, see from Section II B onward) the cost in the worst case is on average is $1/N$, meaning that the whole procedure has to be repeated $\Omega(N)$ times in order to achieve high probability of success; using amplitude amplification, the cost can be brought down to just $\Omega(\sqrt{N})$. In this paper, we show how to reduce the dependence on N to $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt[4]{N})$; furthermore, we show that our algorithm is optimal among those based upon Szegedy quantum walk, since for this class of algorithms $\Omega(\sqrt[4]{N})$ operations are required to prepare $|\pi\rangle$.

² We assume that N is too large to directly compute π from P , and then draw a sample from it; *e.g.*, this is the case when P encodes combinatorially large problems.

³ Intuitively the mixing time measures the number of step that are necessary for the MC to “mix”, that is, to obtain a sample distributed according to the stationary distribution. A formal definition is given in Sec. II A

B. Application to combinatorial optimization and beyond

Famous examples of advantage of quantum walks with respect to classical ones can be achieved from the adoption of coined quantum walks, where the *hitting times* in certain cases can be exponentially reduced [6]. However, such strong results are only known to hold for a few special classes of random walks on undirected graphs. Alternative approaches to quantization of random walks over more general graphs most often aim at more modest polynomial improvements. The generality of these settings, while preventing super-polynomial speedups, compensates with its greater applicability. Early on, quantum algorithms providing a quadratic improvement for element detection [5], element distinctness [18] and the triangle problem [19] were given. Using the Szegedy-type quantum walks, a generic quadratic improvement in hitting times⁴ was later shown for all time-reversible MCs [20, 21]. We remark that, however, in these algorithms the preparation of the relevant stationary distributions is assumed to be an affordable primitive.

Setting aside hitting times, quantum walks have been previously investigated for their capacity to speed up of *mixing times*, i.e., for faster production of elements drawn from a stationary distribution. This task constitutes another fundamental problem of Markov chain theory [22–24]. Quantum improvements in this context have already been reported [8–10, 12, 25–27]. However, despite the considerable interest, the quantum speedup of mixing processes has only been shown for certain classes of MCs [1–4], and it is an open conjecture that a generic quadratic speedup for mixing can be obtained for all time-reversible MCs [25].

Efficient mixing is important in the context of MCMC and simulated annealing methods. In MCMC the task is to produce a sample from the stationary distribution of some target MC P_T . For concreteness, this can be the Gibbs distribution σ_β of a physical system at a target (high) inverse temperature β . Markov chains which have σ_β as the stationary distribution are easy to construct, but, in general, the *mixing time* required to achieve stationarity is prohibitive. Better results are often achieved by using simulated annealing methods, in which one constructs a sequence of MCs $P_1, \dots, P_T \equiv P_\beta$, which, for instance, encode the Gibbs distributions at gradually increasing values of β . The choice of the temperature-dependent sequence is often referred to as the annealing schedule. The fact that the temperatures decrease gradually ensures that the stationary distributions of neighbouring chains are close, so the sequence is slowly evolving. As the temperature corresponding to P_1 is high, the stationary distribution of P_1 is essentially uniform, and P_1 mixes rapidly. Simulated annealing is then realized by sequentially applying the chains P_1 to P_T to the initial distribution. In this process, no individual chain fully mixes, but nonetheless, often the reached distribution approximates the target distribution well, even when the number of steps T is substantially smaller than the mixing time of P_β itself.

II. PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we will set up the notation and define the basic tools we will employ throughout this paper.

In the algorithms we will present, we deal with approximate and probabilistic procedures. The outputs of the algorithms are required to be within ε distance the ideal outputs, where distances are measured in trace norm, and failure probabilities have to be smaller than ε . The accuracy parameter ε will enter only poly-logarithmically in the runtime. That is, the runtime will in general include a $\text{polylog}(\varepsilon^{-1})$ factor.

We will use the soft- \mathcal{O} notation ($\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$) as an extension of the \mathcal{O} notation for asymptotic estimations, whereby logarithmically contributing factors are ignored. That is, $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(f(x)) = \mathcal{O}(f(x) \text{polylog}(x))$. Since ε always enters logarithmically in the runtimes, $\log(\varepsilon^{-1})$ factors are in general not suppressed, but $\log \log(\varepsilon^{-1})$ factors are. However, in the case in which we are interested in producing states only within a *constant accuracy* ε , all the expressions for the runtimes can be simplified, dropping the ε dependencies altogether. Specifically, in Section II and Section III all the $\log^k(\varepsilon^{-1})$ dependencies are maintained, while they are neglected in Section IV and V. These $\log^k(\varepsilon^{-1})$ factors can be restored by analysis of the algorithms, or by analogy with the formulas present in the previous Sections.

A. Markov chain notions

Here we will review the fundamental notions of Markov chain theory which are necessary for the understanding of the results of this work, and refer to [23, 24] for further details.

⁴ The guaranteed quadratic improvement is shown, provided only one target element exists.

a. Transition matrices and probability distributions: Throughout the paper we will deal with discrete-time Markov chains having a finite number N of states. Therefore, to a MC is associated a left-stochastic matrix P (a matrix with non-negative entries which add up to one in every column) of size $N \times N$, and each entry $P_{x,y}$ specifies the transition probability from the state x to state y . Correspondingly, the non-negative (column) vector π denotes a probability distribution over the state space as

$$\begin{aligned} \pi &= (\pi(1), \dots, \pi(N))^T \\ \text{with } \sum_{x=1}^N \pi(x) &= 1. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

A MC is then specified by the transition matrix P and an initial probability distribution π_{in} . We stick to the convention of left-stochastic matrices which act from the left on column vectors π representing probability distributions, that is $\pi' = P\pi$. This convention is not customary in the MC literature (where the usage of right-stochastic matrices prevails), but it matches the one adopted in the quantum information community.

b. Coherent encoding of a probability distribution: Throughout the paper we will be referring to the *coherent encoding* of a distribution π , denoted $|\pi\rangle$. The state $|\pi\rangle$ is a pure state of an N -dimensional system given by

$$|\pi\rangle = \sum_{x=1}^N \sqrt{\pi(x)} |x\rangle. \quad (2)$$

It is clear that a computational basis measurement (so a projective measurement w.r.t. the basis $\{|x\rangle\}_x$) of the state $|\pi\rangle$ outputs an element distributed according to π . We point out that, however, the capability of preparing $|\pi\rangle$ is a much more powerful primitive than the ability of preparing classical samples drawn from π ⁵. For instance, having access to preparation of coherent encodings of probability distributions allows to quadratically speed-up quantum algorithms for Monte Carlo sampling [28]. Even more strikingly, the ability to prepare coherent encodings of probability distributions efficiently (namely, in $\text{polylog}(N)$ time) would allow to solve Graph Isomorphism in polynomial time, alongside all other problems in the Statistical Zero Knowledge class [29].

c. Ergodic MCs: A N -state MC is *irreducible* if it is possible from each state x to reach any other state y in a finite number of steps and with non-zero probability. The *period* of a state x is the largest positive integer such that any return to x can occur only at multiples of that integer. If the period of all states is 1, the MC is said to be *aperiodic*. If P is irreducible and aperiodic, then there exists a unique *stationary distribution* π , such that:

$$P\pi = \pi. \quad (3)$$

This also implies that, under application of a sufficiently large number of steps any initial probability distribution $\tilde{\pi}$ will converge to the unique stationary distribution, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} P^k \tilde{\pi} = \pi$. This convergence process is called *mixing*, and since MCs mix if and only if they are irreducible and aperiodic, these are called *ergodic Markov chains*.

d. Time reversal: The *time reversal* \hat{P} of a Markov chain P having stationary distribution π is defined as:

$$\hat{P}_{x,y} := P_{y,x} \frac{\pi(y)}{\pi(x)} \quad (4)$$

and a MC is said to be time-reversible if it is equal to its time-reversed version, $P = \hat{P}$. Equivalently, a time-reversible MC is one that satisfies the *detailed balance equation*:

$$P_{x,y} \pi(x) = P_{y,x} \pi(y) \quad (5)$$

In the following, we will always consider ergodic and time-reversible MCs.

⁵ Naturally, an even greater computational power is granted if one has a full classical description of the entire probability distribution. However when N is combinatorially large storing such a description is infeasible, while storage of $|\pi\rangle$ only requires a quantum memory consisting of $\log N$ qubits.

e. Mixing times: Obviously, not all mixing process of ergodic MCs are equally fast. Using the *total variation distance*⁶ $d(\pi, \pi') := \frac{1}{2} \sum_x |\pi(x) - \pi'(x)|$, we define $d(k) := \max_{\sigma} d(P^k \sigma, \pi)$ as the distance in distributions between a sample drawn after k walk steps starting from any distribution σ and stationary distribution π of P . The *mixing time* $t_{\text{mix}}(\epsilon)$ then is defined as the smallest time necessary to bring any initial distribution within distance ϵ from the stationary distribution, $d(t_{\text{mix}}(\epsilon)) \leq \epsilon$. We then set $t_{\text{mix}} := t_{\text{mix}}(1/4)$. It can be shown then that the convergence of an ergodic MC is exponentially fast in terms of the mixing time, that is:

$$d(\ell t_{\text{mix}}) \leq 2^{-\ell}. \quad (6)$$

The mixing times often play the critical role in the computational complexity of MC-based algorithms. There are many techniques that can be employed for upper and lower bounding the mixing time, but one of the most useful characterizations is the following. Because of Perron-Frobenius theorem all eigenvalues of a left-stochastic matrix P are smaller or equal to 1 in modulus. If P is ergodic then its stationary distribution $|\pi\rangle$ is the only eigenvector of P having eigenvalue equal to +1. That is, all other eigenvectors have eigenvalues λ with $|\lambda| < 1$. Let $\sigma(P)$ be the spectrum of a time-reversible Markov chain P ; we define the *spectral gap* δ of P as:

$$\delta := 1 - \max_{\substack{\lambda \in \sigma(P): \\ \lambda \neq 1}} |\lambda| \quad (7)$$

i.e. the minimum of $1 - |\lambda|$ over the eigenvalues of P which differ from one. The spectral gap is a rather tight estimate for the inverse of the mixing time, since

$$\left(\frac{1}{\delta} - 1\right) \log\left(\frac{1}{2\epsilon}\right) \leq t_{\text{mix}} \leq \frac{1}{\delta} \log\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon \pi_{\min}}\right) \quad (8)$$

holds for all time-reversible MCs (where π_{\min} is the smallest probability in π). In short we have $t_{\text{mix}} \in \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1/\delta)$ and $1/\delta \in \tilde{\mathcal{O}}(t_{\text{mix}})$, giving asymptotic upper and lower bounds to the mixing time.

B. The Szegedy walk operator

Here, we review the basics of so-called Szegedy-type quantum walks, to an extent inspired by the presentation given in [20, 21].

The basic building block to define the *Szegedy walk operator* $W(P)$ is the *diffusion operator* U_P . The diffusion operator U_P acts on two quantum registers of N states, (partially) defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} U_P |x\rangle |0\rangle &:= |x\rangle \sum_{y=1}^N \sqrt{P_{x,y}} |y\rangle \\ &\equiv |x\rangle |Px\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where $|Px\rangle$ denotes the (coherent encoding of the) distribution over the states one has after one step of the MC when starting from x . The operator U_P is a quantum analogue of the transition matrix P in the sense that a classical random walk can be recovered by applying U_P , measuring the second register, re-setting the first register to $|0\rangle$, and swapping the registers. While U_P is not uniquely defined, any operator satisfying Eq. (9) will do the job. In the following we will assume U_P to be a quantum circuit to which we have oracle access, implying that U_P^\dagger and the controlled version of U_P can be implemented as well.

The operator U_P and its adjoint are then used to construct the following operator:

$$\text{Ref}(A) := U_P (\mathbb{I} \otimes Z) U_P^\dagger, \quad (10)$$

where $Z := 2|0\rangle\langle 0| - \mathbb{I}$ reflects over the state $|0\rangle$. The operator $\text{Ref}(A)$ is itself a reflector, reflecting over the subspace $A := \text{span}(\{|x\rangle | Px\rangle\}_x)$. The Szegedy quantum walk is often explained as a bi-partite walk between two copies of the original graph, and $\text{Ref}(A)$ corresponds to one direction. The other direction is established by

⁶ The total variation distance exactly matches the trace distance in the quantum information context.

defining the diffusion operator in the opposite direction: $V_P := \text{SWAP } U_P \text{ SWAP}$, and proceeding analogously as in the case for the set A , to generate the $\text{Ref}(B)$ operator, reflecting over $B := \text{span}(\{ |Py\rangle | y \rangle \}_y)$. The Szegedy walk operator is then defined as:

$$W(P) := \text{Ref}(B)\text{Ref}(A). \quad (11)$$

With these definitions in place we can further clarify the relationship between the classical transition operator P and the Szegedy walk operator $W(P)$. Let π be the stationary distribution of P , so $P\pi = \pi$. Then the state $|(\pi, P\pi)\rangle := U_P|\pi\rangle|0\rangle$ is also a $+1$ eigenstate of $W(P)$, that is, $W(P)|(\pi, P\pi)\rangle = |(\pi, P\pi)\rangle$. Moreover, in the subspace $A + B$, so-called *busy subspace*, it is the unique $+1$ eigenstate. On the orthogonal complement of the busy subspace, $W(P)$ acts as the identity.

Finally, the spectrum of P and $W(P)$ are intimately related, with the *spectral gap* being (asymptotically) quadratically smaller than the phase gap:

$$\Delta := \min \{ 2|\theta| \mid e^{i\theta} \in \sigma(W(P)), \theta \neq 0 \} \quad (12)$$

where θ denote the arguments of the eigenvalues, i.e. eigenphases, of $W(P)$. This relationship is the very basis of all the speed-up obtained from employing Szegedy-type quantum walks, which we shall elaborate further.

C. Fixed-point amplitude amplification

A tool that we will employ in our algorithms is *fixed-point amplitude amplification* (FPAA), which constitutes a generalization of *Grover search* [30–33]. Here we present FPAA as given in [33].

Subroutine 1 ($\text{FPAA}_{\varepsilon, \eta}(\psi_{in}, \Pi_{out})$): fixed-point amplitude amplification with ε error and initial fidelity larger than η . Suppose that $|\psi_{in}\rangle$ is a input state and V is a target subspace. Then the effect of FPAA is to approximately produce the state $|\psi_{out}\rangle := \Pi_V|\psi_{in}\rangle$, where Π_V is the orthogonal projector onto V .

In order to implement FPAA three ingredients are required:

1. a single copy of the input quantum state $|\psi_{in}\rangle$;
2. the capacity of implementing partial reflectors around the input state $|\psi_{in}\rangle$;
3. the capacity of implementing partial reflectors around the target subspace V .

Specifically, these partial reflectors are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ref}_\phi(\psi) &:= e^{i\phi} |\psi\rangle\langle\psi| + (\mathbb{I} - |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) \\ \text{Ref}_{\phi'}(V) &:= e^{i\phi'} \Pi_V + (\mathbb{I} - \Pi_V) \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

with arbitrary angles ϕ, ϕ' entering in $\text{Ref}_\phi(\psi)$ and $\text{Ref}_{\phi'}(V)$.

The formal specification of FPAA is as follows. A target error ε and a parameter $\eta > 0$ are provided to the algorithm. Suppose that η lower bounds the fidelity between $|\psi_{in}\rangle$ and $|\psi_{out}\rangle$ as $|\langle\psi_{out}|\psi_{in}\rangle| \geq \sqrt{\eta}$. Then, given a single copy of $|\psi_{in}\rangle$, FPAA approximately implements the mapping $|\psi_{in}\rangle \mapsto |\psi_{out}\rangle$ (within ε error). The input state $|\psi_{in}\rangle$ is consumed in the process.

The cost of implementing $\text{FPAA}_{\varepsilon, \eta}$, in terms of oracle calls to the reflectors and of extra gates required, is $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\eta^{-1}} \log \varepsilon^{-1})$, where ε is the error on the output state.

For later convenience, we also introduce $\text{FPAA}_{\varepsilon, \eta}^{\text{flag}}$: this is algorithm obtained by running $\text{FPAA}_{\varepsilon, \eta}^{\text{flag}}$ followed by a projective measurement which either projects the state onto $|\psi_{out}\rangle$ or onto the orthogonal component; if a flag of success is raised, we then know that we have exactly produced $|\psi_{out}\rangle$; otherwise the flag signals an error and we get a state orthogonal to $|\psi_{out}\rangle$. That is, we are trading a (small) *approximation error* ε in $\text{FPAA}_{\varepsilon, \eta}$ for a (small) *failure probability* ε in $\text{FPAA}_{\varepsilon, \eta}^{\text{flag}}$. The use of the flagged version of FPAA is particularly advantageous when a lower bound η for the initial fidelity is not known⁷ and, thus, we do not have a guarantee that the output state is ε -close to the ideal output $|\psi_{out}\rangle$.

⁷ If we set $\eta = 0$ in the optimal FPAA algorithm of [33] it reduces to the so-called $\frac{\pi}{3}$ fixed-point algorithm [32], which does not have a quadratic speed-up.

D. Approximate projection onto $|\pi\rangle$

The first application of the walk operator $W(P)$ is to approximate a projective measurement on the $|\pi\rangle$ state, where π is the stationary distribution of P . The key idea is to exploit the *phase estimation* algorithm, as first formulated by Kitaev [34] and subsequently optimized e.g. as in [35, 36]. Phase estimation returns estimates of the eigenphases θ of a given operator U ; the final step is an inverse quantum Fourier transform (QFT^\dagger) on the phase-containing register. For our purposes this algorithm can be further simplified by substituting the QFT^\dagger with Hadamard gates, as suggested in [12]. This substitution maintains the probability of observing a $\theta = 0$ phase and the corresponding post-selected state and thus can be used to *detect* a non-zero phase. For this reason, this slightly tweaked algorithm is called the *phase detection* algorithm. Details follow.

Subroutine 2 ($\text{Projector}_\varepsilon(\pi)$): approximate projector onto $|\pi\rangle$. Let $|\theta\rangle$ be an eigenvector of $W(P)$ having eigenphase θ , $W(P)|\theta\rangle = e^{i\theta}|\theta\rangle$. We apply phase detection, which approximately transforms any input state of the form

$$|\psi\rangle|0\rangle \equiv \sum_{\theta \in \sigma(W)} \psi_\theta |\theta\rangle|0\rangle \quad (14)$$

into a state having the form

$$\psi_0 |\theta = 0\rangle | \text{“}\theta \text{ is } 0\text{”} \rangle + \sum_{\substack{\theta \in \sigma(W) \\ \theta \neq 0}} \psi_\theta |\theta\rangle | \text{“}\theta \text{ is not } 0\text{”} \rangle. \quad (15)$$

That is, the second register will contain a string signalling whether the state has zero eigenphase or not. Measuring the second register allows to (approximately) implement a projective measurement onto the 0-eigenphase of $W(P)$ (i.e. onto $|\theta = 0\rangle = |\pi\rangle$) or the orthogonal component. When the measurement of the second register returns $\theta = 0$ the output state is ε close to $|\pi\rangle$.

Since $W(P)$ has a phase gap $\Delta = \Theta(\sqrt{\delta})$, it is sufficient to apply phase detection within precision $\mathcal{O}(\Delta/\log \varepsilon^{-1})$ to implement the projective measurement up to ε error. Therefore the cost of the phase detection procedure, both in terms of oracle accesses to controlled- $W(P)$ and of extra gates cost, is $\mathcal{O}(\Delta^{-1} \log \varepsilon^{-1}) = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\delta}^{-1} \log \varepsilon^{-1})$, where ε is the probability of error (see Theorem 6 of [21] or Theorem 1 of [35]).

The success probability of this measurement, applied on the pure state $|\psi\rangle$, is in $\Omega(|\langle \psi | \pi \rangle|^2)$, i.e., is proportional to the fidelity (squared) between the input state and the $|\pi\rangle$ state; note that if the measurement were perfect, the success probability would be exactly the fidelity. Moreover, there is a classical flag that signals whether the application of the projection was successful or not. This allows, for instance, to repeat the measurement process many times until the algorithm succeeds in projecting onto the target state.

E. Approximate reflector over $|\pi\rangle$

Another application of Szegedy quantum walk is to approximately implement a (partial) reflector $\text{Ref}_\phi(\pi) = e^{i\phi}|\pi\rangle\langle\pi| + (\mathbb{I} - |\pi\rangle\langle\pi|)$. Notice that for $\phi = 180^\circ$ the partial reflector reduces to a standard reflector $\text{Ref}(\pi) = \mathbb{I} - 2|\pi\rangle\langle\pi|$. The construction of this operator is very similar to the one we gave for the $|\pi\rangle$ projective measurement.

Subroutine 3 ($\text{Reflector}_{\varepsilon,\phi}(\pi)$): approximate reflector around $|\pi\rangle$. After the phase detection as in Eq. (15) we apply a phase $e^{i\phi}$ in the $\theta = 0$ component, finally followed by the phase detection run in reverse to “uncompute”

the value contained in the second register. That is:

$$\begin{aligned}
|\psi\rangle|0\rangle &\mapsto \psi_0|\theta=0\rangle|\text{"}\theta \text{ is } 0''\rangle + \sum_{\substack{\theta \in \sigma(W) \\ \theta \neq 0}} \psi_\theta|\theta\rangle|\text{"}\theta \text{ is not } 0''\rangle \\
&\mapsto e^{i\phi} \psi_0|\theta=0\rangle|\text{"}\theta \text{ is } 0''\rangle + \sum_{\substack{\theta \in \sigma(W) \\ \theta \neq 0}} \psi_\theta|\theta\rangle|\text{"}\theta \text{ is not } 0''\rangle \\
&\mapsto \left(e^{i\phi} \psi_0|\theta=0\rangle + \sum_{\substack{\theta \in \sigma(W) \\ \theta \neq 0}} \psi_\theta|\theta\rangle \right) |0\rangle
\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

which approximately implements $\text{Ref}_\phi(\pi)$ once one identifies $|\theta=0\rangle = |\pi\rangle$, since $|\pi\rangle$ is the unique $+1$ eigenvector of $W(P)$.

Just as previously for the projective measurement, the total cost of implementing this partial reflector is $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\delta^{-1}} \log \varepsilon^{-1})$. Thus, the second gadget in our toolbox is the operator $\text{Ref}_\phi(\pi)$ which approximates a partial reflection over $|\pi\rangle$. In the next section, we will employ this partial reflector to implement FPAA.

F. Approximate deterministic projection onto $|\pi\rangle$

By using the subroutine $\text{Reflector}_{\varepsilon,\phi}(\pi)$ within FPAA, one achieves the ability to deterministically (but approximately) project an input state $|\psi_{in}\rangle$ onto the target state $|\pi\rangle$.

Subroutine 4 ($\text{DeterministicProjector}_{\varepsilon,\eta}(\psi_{in}, \pi)$): approximate *deterministic* projector onto $|\pi\rangle$. Suppose that we are given an initial state $|\psi_{in}\rangle$ and the ability to (approximately) implement $\text{Ref}_\phi(\psi_{in})$. Moreover, we have access to an ergodic time-reversible MC having transition matrix P and stationary distribution π . Then we have all the ingredients necessary for running $\text{FPAA}_{\varepsilon,\eta}$. Namely, if we provide to **DeterministicProjector** a target error ε and a parameter $\eta > 0$ such that $|\langle \pi | \psi_{in} \rangle| \geq \sqrt{\eta}$, **DeterministicProjector** produces an output state ε -close to $|\pi\rangle$.

Moreover, the algorithm can be modified by running $\text{FPAA}_{\varepsilon,\eta}^{\text{flag}}$ instead. In this case, a flag of success is raised which signals the correct preparation of a state ε -close to $|\pi\rangle$. The resulting algorithm, which we call $\text{DeterministicProjector}_{\varepsilon,\eta}^{\text{flag}}$, is useful since it can be run even when a value $\sqrt{\eta'} \not\leq |\langle \pi | \psi_{in} \rangle|$ is provided: if the flag signalling success is raised, the resulting state is guaranteed to be close to $|\pi\rangle$ notwithstanding the value of η' .

DeterministicProjector can be used when $|\psi\rangle = |\pi_{t-1}\rangle$ and $|\pi\rangle = |\pi_t\rangle$; that is, we want to project the (coherent encoding of) stationary distribution of the MC at time step $t-1$ onto the corresponding one at time t . The cost of the deterministic projection operation scales as $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\sqrt{\eta^{-1}}\sqrt{\delta^{-1}} \log^2 \varepsilon^{-1})$, where η is a lower bound on the fidelity between $|\psi\rangle$, $|\pi\rangle$, δ is the spectral gap of P , and ε is the final target error; the $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ notation hides $\log \log \varepsilon^{-1}$ factors. The reason for the $\log^2 \varepsilon^{-1}$ dependence comes from nesting two approximate algorithms (**Reflector** and **FPAA**). In our context of slowly evolving Markov chains $|\pi_{t-1}\rangle$ and $|\pi_t\rangle$ have constant overlap; the projection is therefore efficient with the main cost being determined by the mixing time (proportionally to $\sqrt{\delta^{-1}}$).

A detailed cost analysis of **DeterministicProjector** is given in Appendix A.

III. MAIN ALGORITHMS

We will begin establishing the notation for the remainder of the paper. We are considering a sequence of ergodic time-reversible Markov chains $\{P_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$. Then a given element in the sequence will be specified by a subscript t ; specifically, transition matrices, spectral gaps, and stationary probability distributions will be referred to as P_t, δ_t , and π_t for the t -th element in the sequence; also, at each time step t we can associate a Szegedy walk operators $W(P_t)$ to the corresponding transition matrix P_t . We assume throughout the paper

that the values δ_t are known⁸, so that phase estimation can be directly employed to the effect of implementing approximate reflectors around $|\pi_t\rangle$. We notice, however, that only the transition matrices P_t will change from one element of the sequence to the next, while the state space will be held fixed.

Our aim is, at each time-step t , to generate the coherent encoding of the stationary distribution $|\pi_t\rangle$, within cost $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{\delta_t^{-1}}\sqrt[4]{N})$. Naively we get a complexity $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{\delta_t^{-1}}\sqrt[4]{N})$ when using the Szegedy operator to prepare $|\pi_t\rangle$ from a randomly chosen initial state. In order to achieve this improvement we require the further assumption that the Markov chains are *slowly evolving*. Namely, we assume that the stationary distributions π_{t-1}, π_t of neighbouring Markov chains P_{t-1}, P_t are sufficiently close in terms of the fidelity of their coherent encodings. That is, we require that $|\langle \pi_t | \pi_{t-1} \rangle|^2 \geq \eta$, where $\eta > 0$ is a real constant independent from the spectral gaps (δ_t) and the state space size (N). Finally, we will assume that the coherent encoding $|\pi_{in}\rangle$ of the distribution given as input to the first Markov chain is easy to generate⁹.

These assumptions are essentially equivalent to the ones made in [10, 12]. However in our algorithms the stationary distribution can be prepared *de novo* at each time-step t , that is without re-running again the entire MC sequence, and the cost of this operation is $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{\delta_t^{-1}}\sqrt[4]{N})$, independently from the length of the sequence. Finally, errors in state preparation do not accumulate in time, since the newly generated states are always created within accuracy ε from the ideal output. These properties are vital in the context of active learning agents that we have described in Sec. I A.

For the task of preparing the coherent encoding $|\pi_t\rangle$ we will give two different algorithms, in the spirit of what is shown in the top, respectively bottom, panels in Fig. 1. In the former case, only classical memory is used between time step $t-1$ and time step t in the sequence. In the latter case, we also allow quantum memory, namely we also allow for quantum states to be transmitted between consecutive time steps. In both cases, however, we assume that at time step t we have access to the transition probability matrices P_t and P_{t-1} . This can always be done at the cost of doubling the memory requirement (thus, without affecting the asymptotic analysis).

As a motivational example where the difference between classical and quantum memory is relevant, consider the scenario of the rPS as detailed in Sec. I A. The internal configuration of the agent at a given time step t is modelled as a MC with transition matrix P_t . In each interaction round the agent has to wait for the environment to give a response (together with, possibly, a reward) to its action. Only after this response, as a consequence of a reinforcement learning process, the internal configuration is updated. It can be the case that the environment reacts slowly, thus maintaining a coherent quantum memory between successive time steps might be infeasible. In this case, at time step t only classical information from time step $t-1$ may be preserved.

A. Preparation from uniform and from samples

The method that we employ in order to prepare $|\pi\rangle$ is to choose a suitable initial state $|\psi\rangle$ and apply `DeterministicProjector` to map this initial state to the target state $|\pi\rangle$. The key idea we use to achieve a $O(\sqrt[4]{N})$ preparation cost in the context of slowly evolving MCs is to consider two different choices for the initial state $|\psi\rangle$ and employ whichever of the two methods is faster. Specifically, the two initial choices are given by the uniform distribution (\mathbf{u}) and the second from a classical sample x drawn from the stationary distribution (π) of P . Notice that classical memory is sufficient to give a description of x and, therefore, also to prepare from scratch the state $|x\rangle$.

These two methods are fundamentally different, the former being deterministic, i.e. the starting state is fixed (the uniform distribution), while the second is inherently stochastic, depending on which elements are sampled in each step. Also, the first method is applicable even when presented with a stand-alone Markov chain, i.e. a chain not embedded in a slowly evolving sequence. Finally, we remark that the idea on which the second method is inspired is that of *un-searching* [37]: in search (or rather in hitting-type MC algorithms) one typically starts from a distribution $|\pi\rangle$ and searches for an element $|x\rangle$; here we run the algorithm in reverse to recover the distribution $|\pi\rangle$ from a sample $|x\rangle$. We will denote the first method as `PrepareFromUniform` and the second as `PrepareFromSample`.

As explained in Section II F it is possible to realize `DeterministicProjector`, projecting an initial state $|\psi\rangle$ onto the target state $|\pi\rangle$. Notice that all the three ingredients necessary for implementing `DeterministicProjector` (a

⁸ Effectively, we only require sensible lower bounds on the spectral gaps.

⁹ Quite often a natural initial choice is given by $\pi_{in} = \mathbf{u}$.

copy of the input state $|\psi\rangle$ the ability of reflecting around $|\psi\rangle$ and $|\pi\rangle$ are present when $|\psi\rangle$ is either the uniform distribution or a single, known, classical sample¹⁰. We can thus employ `DeterministicProjector` as the main tool for implementing `PrepareFromUniform` and `PrepareFromSample`¹¹. The total runtime of `DeterministicProjector` is $\tilde{O}(|\langle\psi|\pi\rangle|^{-1}\sqrt{\delta^{-1}}\log^2\varepsilon^{-1})$. That is, for the moment we assume that the value $|\langle\psi|\pi\rangle|^{-1}$ is known and provided as an input parameter to `DeterministicProjector`.

Now we will give an expression for $|\langle\psi|\pi\rangle|^{-1}$ for our two choices for $|\psi\rangle$, that is, for $|\psi\rangle = |\mathbf{u}\rangle$ or $|\psi\rangle = |x\rangle$, where x is a classical sample extracted from π . Correspondingly, we will provide an estimate of the cost of implementing the `PrepareFromUniform` and the `PrepareFromSample` subroutines.

a. Cost of PrepareFromUniform When applying the first method, `PrepareFromUniform`, the initial ansatz is $|\psi\rangle = |\mathbf{u}\rangle$, where \mathbf{u} is the uniform distribution over N elements; hence the cost of running `DeterministicProjector` is proportional to

$$|\langle\mathbf{u}|\pi\rangle|^{-1} = \left(\sum_{x=1}^N \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sqrt{\pi(x)}\right)^{-1} = \frac{\sqrt{N}}{\sum_x \sqrt{\pi(x)}} = \frac{\sqrt{N}}{\|\pi\|_{1/2}^{1/2}}, \quad (17)$$

in which we have introduced the p vector pseudo-norm $\|\mathbf{v}\|_p := (\sum_i |v_i|^p)^{1/p}$, for $p = 1/2$ here¹². That is:

$$\|\pi\|_{1/2}^{1/2} := \sum_x \sqrt{\pi(x)}. \quad (18)$$

Notice moreover that by standard norm inequalities, if $p \geq q > 0$:

$$\|\mathbf{v}\|_p \leq \|\mathbf{v}\|_q \leq N^{1/q-1/p} \|\mathbf{v}\|_p, \quad (19)$$

hence using $\|\pi\|_1 = 1$:

$$1 \leq \|\pi\|_{1/2}^{1/2} \leq \sqrt{N}, \quad (20)$$

where the lower bound is saturated by probability distributions having support over a single element, the upper bound by the uniform distribution.

b. Cost of PrepareFromSample In order to bound the cost of running `DeterministicProjector` from a randomly chosen sample from π we introduce a random variable X distributed according to π , i.e., X takes a value x with probability $\pi(x)$. The cost of `DeterministicProjector` starting from an initial sample x is proportional to $|\langle x|\pi\rangle|^{-1} = 1/\sqrt{\pi(x)}$; that is, the runtime of `DeterministicProjector` is a random variable proportional to $\pi^{-1/2}(X)$. The average running time is then

$$\mathbb{E}[\pi^{-1/2}(X)] = \sum_{x=1}^N \pi(x) \times \pi^{-1/2}(x) = \|\pi\|_{1/2}^{1/2}. \quad (21)$$

Moreover, we can employ Markov's inequality to give a bound on the probability that $X^{-1/2}$ exceeds its expectation value:

$$\Pr\{\pi^{-1/2}(X) \geq a \mathbb{E}[\pi^{-1/2}(X)]\} \leq \frac{1}{a}. \quad (22)$$

This allows us to set for instance $a = 2$, and repeat the sampling c times and try to run `DeterministicProjector` from each of these samples. Being the samples independent, the probability that the inverse fidelity is $|\langle x|\pi\rangle|^{-1} \geq 2\|\pi\|_{1/2}^{1/2}$ for all sampled states x is upper bounded by 2^{-c} ; which implies that the failure probability goes down exponentially in c when using `DeterministicProjector` with parameter $2\|\pi\|_{1/2}^{1/2}$ as a bound to the inverse of the fidelity (and then repeating for c samples).

¹⁰ When $N = 2^n$ the uniform distribution $|\mathbf{u}\rangle = N^{-1/2} \sum_x |x\rangle$ can be implemented applying Hadamard gates to n qubits initialized in $|0\rangle$, and also states of the form $|x\rangle$ can be prepared from $|0\rangle$ with $\mathcal{O}(\log N)$ gates. The ability to prepare a state from $|0\rangle$ allows to implement reflectors around that state, as in Eq. (10).

¹¹ Using `DeterministicProjector` allows for a simpler exposition of our algorithms, but similar results can be obtained using a projective measurement `Projector`.

¹² It is a pseudo-norm because the triangle inequality is not satisfied for $p < 1$.

c. General cost In our algorithms we will employ both `PrepareFromUniform` and `PrepareFromSample` in parallel and then exploit whichever strategy is more efficient (on average) in preparing $|\pi\rangle$. The overall cost of running both methods is at most twice that of running them individually, and the asymptotic analysis is unaffected. Hence the (asymptotic) cost can be upper-bounded by the fastest of the two strategies, whence summarizing Eq. (17) and Eq. (21) we have that preparation of $|\pi\rangle$ using `DeterministicProjector` is $\tilde{O}(C(\pi)\sqrt{\delta^{-1}}\log^2\varepsilon^{-1})$, where:

$$C(\pi) := \min \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{N}}{\|\pi\|_{1/2}^{1/2}}, \|\pi\|_{1/2}^{1/2} \right\} \leq \sqrt[4]{N}. \quad (23)$$

In Eq. (23) the inequality $C(\pi) \leq \sqrt[4]{N}$ follows from using the bounds in (19).

d. Formal specifications We are now ready to give a complete description of the `PrepareFromUniform` and `PrepareFromSamples` algorithms. We suppose that an estimate $\chi \approx \|\pi\|_{1/2}^{1/2}$ is provided.

Algorithm 1 `PrepareFromUniform` _{ε, c, χ'} (P)

Output: a flag bit signalling success; in case of success, c copies of the state $|\pi\rangle$, where π is the stationary distribution of a Markov chain P .

Input: quantum access to the Markov chain P ; ε , the target error; c , the required number of copies of $|\pi\rangle$; a value $\chi' \equiv \sqrt{N}/\chi$ which (supposedly) is an estimate of $\sqrt{N}/\|\pi\|_{1/2}^{1/2} = |\langle \mathbf{u} | \pi \rangle|^{-1}$.

Algorithm:

1. For $j = 1, \dots, 2c$:
Run `DeterministicProjector` _{$\varepsilon, 1/\chi'$} ^{flag}(\mathbf{u}, π).
 2. If at least c flag of success have been raised in step 1., output a global flag of success, together with the quantum states given as output from c successful runs of `DeterministicProjector`. Else, return a flag of failure.
-

The worst case runtime of `PrepareFromUniform` _{ε, c, χ'} is in $\tilde{O}(c\chi'\sqrt{\delta^{-1}}\log^2\varepsilon^{-1})$. In the case in which $\chi \geq |\langle \mathbf{u} | \pi \rangle|^{-1}$ the (global) failure probability is $2^{-\mathcal{O}(c)}$; the analysis of this failure probability is in Appendix B.

For running `PrepareFromSamples` we need, rather obviously, an extra input; namely, a set $\vec{x} := \{x_1, \dots, x_c\}$ of c classical samples drawn from π .

Algorithm 2 `PrepareFromSamples` _{ε, c, χ} (P, \vec{x})

Output: a flag bit signalling success; in case of success, c copies of the state $|\pi\rangle$, where π is the stationary distribution of a Markov chain P .

Input: quantum access to the Markov chain P and c samples $\vec{x} = \{x_1, \dots, x_c\}$ approximately drawn from its stationary distribution; ε , the target error; c the required number of copies of $|\pi\rangle$ (equal to the number of input samples); a value χ which (supposedly) is an estimate of $\|\pi\|_{1/2}^{1/2} = \mathbb{E}[\pi^{-1/2}(X)]$.

Algorithm:

1. For $j = 1, \dots, c$:
Run for $2c$ times `DeterministicProjector` _{$\varepsilon, 1/(2\chi)$} ^{flag}(x_j, π).
 2. If at least c flag of success have been raised in step 1., output a global flag of success, together with the quantum states given as output from c successful runs of `DeterministicProjector`. Else, return a flag of failure.
-

The worst case runtime of `PrepareFromSamples` _{ε, c, χ} is in $\tilde{O}(c^2\chi\sqrt{\delta^{-1}}\log^2\varepsilon^{-1})$. It is easy to see that, using appropriate heuristics and halting the algorithm when the success rate is too low, that the expected runtime can be brought down to just $\tilde{O}(c)$ from the naive $\mathcal{O}(c^2)$ runtime as in the formulation given in Algorithm 2. In the case in which $\chi \geq \mathbb{E}[\pi^{-1/2}(X)]$ the global failure probability is $2^{-\mathcal{O}(c)}$; for details see Appendix B.

B. Classical memory algorithm

Here we describe an algorithm that allows one to prepare c copies of the state $|\pi_t\rangle$ when only classical information is carried over from time step $t-1$ to time step t ¹³. Explicitly, this classical information will consist of c samples drawn from the distribution π_{t-1} , for a chosen number c of copies. Moreover, we retain (quantum) access to the transition matrix P_{t-1} . In the end, since only classical memory can be retained, we will measure the c copies of $|\pi_t\rangle$ in the “computational basis” to retrieve c approximate samples from π_t .

We proceed inductively¹⁴, showing that if we have access to c independent samples $\vec{x} = \{x_1, \dots, x_c\}$ distributed according to π_{t-1} , this allows us to prepare c copies of $|\pi_t\rangle$ in time $\tilde{O}(cC(\pi_{t-1})\sqrt{\delta_{t'}^{-1}}\log^2 \varepsilon^{-1})$, where $\delta_{t'}$ is the smallest of the two spectral gaps, $\delta_{t'} = \min\{\delta_{t-1}, \delta_t\}$. We will furthermore make the assumption that the neighbouring spectral gaps δ_{t-1}, δ_t and neighbouring cost parameters $C(\pi_{t-1}), C(\pi_t)$ are multiplicatively close; this means that there exists constant $\kappa, \kappa' \geq 1$ (independent from N) such that for all t we have

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa^{-1} \delta_{t-1} &\leq \delta_t \leq \kappa \delta_{t-1}, \\ \kappa'^{-1} C(\pi_{t-1}) &\leq C(\pi_t) \leq \kappa' C(\pi_{t-1}). \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

This assumption is not essential, but allows to write the cost of preparation simply as $\tilde{O}(cC(\pi_t)\sqrt{\delta_t^{-1}}\log^2 \varepsilon^{-1})$ for each t , which was the desired cost.

For ease of explanation, we describe first the algorithm when an estimate $\chi_{t-1} \approx \|\pi_{t-1}\|_{1/2}^{1/2}$ is provided.

Algorithm 3 Classical-memory state preparation, given χ_{t-1} .

Input: quantum access to Markov chains P_{t-1}, P_t , and a set \vec{x} of c samples drawn from π_{t-1} ; ε , the target error; a value χ_{t-1} which is (supposedly) an estimate of $\|\pi_{t-1}\|_{1/2}^{1/2}$.

Output: a flag signalling success; in case of success, also c classical samples from π_t .

Algorithm:

1. If $\chi_{t-1} \geq \sqrt[4]{N}$, we set $\chi'_{t-1} := \sqrt{N}/\chi$ and run $\text{PrepareFromUniform}_{\varepsilon, c, \chi'}(P_{t-1})$.
Else ($\chi_{t-1} < \sqrt[4]{N}$), we run $\text{PrepareFromSamples}_{\varepsilon, c, \chi}(P_{t-1}, \vec{x})$.
 2. In either case, upon raising of a flag of success from the state preparation algorithm, we are in possession of c approximate copies of $|\pi_{t-1}\rangle$. For each copy then we run $\text{DeterministicProjector}_{\varepsilon, \eta}(\pi_{t-1}, \pi_t)$; we end up having c copies of $|\pi_t\rangle$ which can be, subsequently, measured in the computational basis to return c classical samples from π_t . The flag of the entire algorithm (signalling either success or failure) is the same as that provided in the previous step of the algorithm¹⁵.
-

The total runtime of the classical-memory state preparation algorithm as given above is the sum of $\tilde{O}(c\chi_{t-1}\sqrt{\delta_{t-1}^{-1}}\log^2 \varepsilon^{-1})$, inherent to the first step, and of $\tilde{O}(c\sqrt{\min\{\delta_{t-1}, \delta_t\}^{-1}}\log^2 \varepsilon^{-1})$, inherent to the second step. Using the simplifying assumption given in Eq. (24) the sum of the two costs can be written as $\tilde{O}(c\chi_t\sqrt{\delta_t^{-1}}\log^2 \varepsilon^{-1})$.

In the (more realistic) case in which $\|\pi_{t-1}\|_{1/2}^{1/2}$ is not known, we modify the algorithm so that it will provide for itself an estimate of $\chi_{t-1} \approx \|\pi_{t-1}\|_{1/2}^{1/2}$ in the process. Specifically, it will run the state preparation as given in Algorithm 3 starting from $\chi_{t-1} = 1$ and then doubling the value of χ_{t-1} until the algorithm raises a flag of success, for some $\chi_{t-1}^{j_{\max}} = 2^{j_{\max}}$. Since the cost of Algorithm 3 is proportional to χ_{t-1} , the total cost of the Algorithm 4 is proportional to $\sum_{j=1}^{j_{\max}} 2^j \leq 2 \cdot 2^{j_{\max}} = \mathcal{O}(\chi_{t-1}^{\max})$. When the current estimate for χ_{t-1} becomes larger than $\|\pi_{t-1}\|_{1/2}^{1/2}$ the algorithm succeeds (almost) deterministically, hence the total cost is still in $\mathcal{O}(C(\pi_{t-1}))$. In summary, with the simplifying assumption (24), the total cost of the classical memory algorithm returning c samples from π_t is $\tilde{O}(cC(\pi_t)\sqrt{\delta_t^{-1}}\log^2 \varepsilon^{-1})$. The failure probability is in $2^{-\mathcal{O}(c)}$, see Appendix B.

¹³ Note, however, that the information processing within one step is in principle fully quantum.

¹⁴ The first step of the induction does not need to be proven separately, since it is equal to the other steps: by assumption we can efficiently prepare the state $|\pi_0\rangle \equiv |\pi_{in}\rangle$ for the first input probability distribution π_{in} .

¹⁵ Notice that in this second step η is the constant such that $|\langle \pi_t | \pi_{t-1} \rangle| \geq \sqrt{\eta}$ for all t ; thus success of the $\text{DeterministicProjector}$ is, by assumption, guaranteed.

Algorithm 4 Classical-memory state preparation.

Input: quantum access to Markov chains P_{t-1}, P_t , and a set \vec{x} of c samples drawn from π_{t-1} ; ε , the target error.

Output: a flag signalling success; in case of success, also c classical samples from π_t .

Algorithm:

1. Set $\chi = 1$.
 2. Run the classical-memory state preparation as given Algorithm 3 with parameter χ .
 3. Run the classical-memory state preparation as given Algorithm 3 with parameter $\chi' \equiv \sqrt{N}/\chi$.
 4. If a flag of success is raised either at step 2. or 3., then output a flag of success and the c samples. Else, set $\chi \leftarrow 2\chi$.
 5. If $\chi > 2^{\lceil \log \sqrt[4]{N} \rceil}$ output a flag signalling failure. Else, go to step 2.
-

C. Quantum memory algorithm

We now consider an algorithm for quantum state preparation in the case in which one has at disposition a (long term) quantum memory that can store quantum states from time step $t-1$ to time step t in the sequence of Markov Chains. In this case we show that it is possible to almost deterministically prepare two (or more) copies of $|\pi_t\rangle$ at a cost $\tilde{O}(\sqrt[4]{N})$ starting from a *single copy* of $|\pi_{t-1}\rangle$. This contrast with the case in which only a classical memory is available, whereby many classical samples are required to achieve the same goal; more precisely, we need $c = \mathcal{O}(\log \epsilon^{-1})$ samples to achieve a $\Theta(\epsilon)$ failure probability¹⁶.

Specifically, the quantum-memory algorithm does the following: it starts from a state $|\pi_{t-1}\rangle$; projects this state onto $|\pi_t\rangle$ using **DeterministicProjector**; then duplicates the state to $|\pi_t\rangle^{\otimes 2}$. One of the two copies is provided as the external output of the current MC in the sequence¹⁷; the second copy is provided as input to the next MC in the sequence. See panel (d) of Fig. 1.

Inductively, we suppose that a state $|\pi_{t-1}\rangle$ is provided from the MC-based quantum algorithm run at time step $t-1$. Using **DeterministicProjector** it is possible to almost deterministically project $|\pi_{t-1}\rangle$ onto $|\pi_t\rangle$; as usual, this projection is efficient if the fidelity between $|\pi_{t-1}\rangle$ and $|\pi_t\rangle$ is large and the mixing times of P_{t-1} and P_t are not too large. Thus, hereafter we only have to provide a *state duplication* algorithm, which duplicates $|\pi\rangle$ having access to a copy of it and to reflectors around it.

Subroutine 5 (State duplication algorithm). *We consider a MC with transition matrix P and stationary probability π . We suppose that we also have as input the state $|\pi\rangle$, together with an estimate χ which is multiplicatively close to $\|\pi\|_{1/2}^{1/2}$ (i.e., there is a constant $\kappa \geq 1$ such that $\kappa^{-1}\chi \leq \|\pi\|_{1/2}^{1/2} \leq \kappa\chi$).*

*If $\chi \geq \sqrt[4]{N}$, then **PrepareFromUniform** is the more efficient strategy. This strategy does not use the input state $|\pi\rangle$ at all, and simply produces de novo $|\pi\rangle$ from the uniform distribution.*

*Else ($\chi < \sqrt[4]{N}$), we employ **PrepareFromSamples**, which in this case is more efficient. More precisely, we consider a unitary U_{alg} that implements a coherent version of **PrepareFromSamples** _{$\varepsilon, 1, \kappa\chi$} as described in Algorithm 2. That is, U_{alg} tries to prepare a state $|\pi\rangle$ from a single classical sample drawn from π (with a target error ε and cost parameter $\kappa\chi$). This operation has only a finite success probability, whereas we would like to boost it to an algorithm having an arbitrarily high success probability. Namely, the effect of U_{alg} upon the input of a sample x drawn from π is as follows:*

$$U_{alg}|x\rangle = \sqrt{p_{succ}(x)}|\pi\rangle|\text{ok}\rangle + \sqrt{1-p_{succ}(x)}|\psi_x\rangle|\text{err}\rangle, \quad (25)$$

where the second register contains a flag heralding the successful preparation of $|\pi\rangle$. The algorithm U_{alg} has a runtime proportional to $\kappa\chi$ and achieves, averaging over a random variable X distributed as π , a constant success probability (say, larger than $1/2$). That is:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi}[p_{succ}(X)] = \sum_x \pi(x) p_{succ}(x) \geq \frac{1}{2}, \quad (26)$$

¹⁶ Here the *failure* probability ϵ is different from the *approximation* parameter ε . Effectively, we can take ε to be a constant, which tells us how accurate the output states $|\pi_t\rangle$ need to be, while ϵ has to be vanishingly small, in order for the sequence of MCs to continue essentially forever.

¹⁷ In the active learning agent scenario, this quantum state is returned to the external environment and represents the action performed by the agent.

from which ensues the inequality

$$\mathbb{E}_{\pi}[p_{succ}^2] \geq \mathbb{E}_{\pi}^2[p_{succ}] \geq \frac{1}{4}. \quad (27)$$

We thus consider the following quantum computation

$$\begin{aligned} |\pi\rangle &= \sum_x \sqrt{\pi(x)} |x\rangle \\ &\mapsto \sum_x \sqrt{\pi(x)} |x\rangle |x\rangle \\ &\mapsto \sum_x \sqrt{\pi(x)} U_{alg}|x\rangle U_{alg}|x\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

whereby we have duplicated the classical information contained in the register and applied U_{alg} on both registers. The state in Eq. (28) is then ε -close to

$$|\tilde{\pi}^{(2)}\rangle := \sqrt{p'_{succ}} |\pi\rangle^{\otimes 2} |\text{ok}'\rangle + \sqrt{1-p'_{succ}} |\psi\rangle |\text{err}'\rangle, \quad (29)$$

where the second register is in $|\text{ok}'\rangle$ if both instances of U_{alg} have raised a success flag for preparing $|\pi\rangle$ and it is in $|\text{err}'\rangle$ if either instance has raised a failure flag. It follows from (27) that $p'_{succ} \geq 1/4$. Hence upon measurement of the second register of $|\tilde{\pi}^{(2)}\rangle$, when we obtain as outcome $|\text{ok}'\rangle$, we obtain in the first register two copies of $|\pi\rangle$; this happens with probability larger than $1/4$.

The final step of our algorithm is to apply FPAA to deterministically project the state $|\tilde{\pi}^{(2)}\rangle$ onto the support of the projector $\Pi_{\text{ok}} := \mathbb{I} \otimes |\text{ok}'\rangle\langle\text{ok}'|$. Notice that all the ingredients for FPAA are present: we have an initial copy of $|\tilde{\pi}^{(2)}\rangle$; a partial reflection over Π_{ok} can be done with $\mathcal{O}(1)$ operations; and, finally, a partial reflection $\text{Ref}_{\phi}(|\tilde{\pi}^{(2)}\rangle)$ can be implemented as

$$\text{Ref}_{\phi}(|\tilde{\pi}^{(2)}\rangle) = \text{Ref}_{\phi}(V_{alg}|\pi\rangle) = V_{alg} \text{Ref}_{\phi}(|\pi\rangle) V_{alg}^{\dagger} \quad (30)$$

where V_{alg} is the transformation given in Eq. (28). The final output of the algorithm is then, almost surely, a state ε -close to $|\pi\rangle^{\otimes 2} |\text{ok}'\rangle$.

Notice that the final run of FPAA in the state duplication algorithm is quite efficient, since the overlap between the input and output state is constant. Thus only $\mathcal{O}(\log \varepsilon^{-1})$ reflectors are needed to get ε -close to the desired output. Each reflector as in Eq. 30 requires $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\chi \sqrt{\delta^{-1}} \log^2 \varepsilon^{-1})$ operations to be implemented, where the runtime is dominated by the implementation of V_{alg} , which requires to run in parallel two copies of `PrepareFromSamples`.

Summarizing, the cost of the state duplication algorithm is $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\chi' \sqrt{\delta^{-1}} \log^2 \varepsilon^{-1})$ when `PrepareFromUniform` is employed (with $\chi' = \sqrt{N}/\chi$) and to $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\chi \sqrt{\delta^{-1}} \log^3 \varepsilon^{-1})$ when it recurs to `PrepareFromSamples`.

We notice again that we need to assume that an estimate χ of $\|\pi\|_{1/2}^{1/2}$ is known for the state duplication algorithm to work. If no such estimate is available, we can always take the worst case choice $\chi = \sqrt[4]{N}$. Namely, first we attempt to prepare $|\pi\rangle$ using `PrepareFromUniform` with runtime in $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt[4]{N})$; if this fails, then we know that we are sufficiently “far” from the uniform distribution, thus `PrepareFromSamples`, again with runtime in $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt[4]{N})$, must succeed. Alternatively, we can always revert to the classical-memory algorithm if this happens to be more efficient.

As a concluding remark we notice that if we want to output $c \geq 3$ copies of $|\pi\rangle$, this can be obtained by applying the state duplication algorithm in sequence many times; that is, using one of the output states as the input of a new instance of the state duplication algorithm¹⁸.

¹⁸ If one tried, instead, to modify the derivation in Eq. (28) to directly produce c copies this would incur in an exponential decrease of the success probability.

D. Comparison of classical and quantum memory algorithms

We finish this section with a comment on how total failure can be dealt with, when failure is not an option. In the context of (effectively) infinite sequences of Markov chains, the exponentially unlikely failure will still occur. In this case, if we are required to proceed although the protocol failed at time-step t , one can always prepare c samples from $|\pi_t\rangle$ with runtime, in the worst case scenario, $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(N^{1/2}\sqrt{\delta_t^{-1}}\log^2\varepsilon^{-1})$, by forcing the preparation from the uniform distribution. Although this constitutes a quadratic slowdown (w.r.t. the state space size), it will only occur exponentially rarely in c .

Then, a reasonable choice for c is the one that minimizes the expected runtime of the state preparation algorithm, averaging over the cases in which runtimes are in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\sqrt[4]{N})$ and cases (exponentially rare) in which they are in $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\sqrt{N})$. That is, the amortized cost scales proportionally to

$$\mathcal{O}\left((1-2^{-c})c\sqrt[4]{N}+2^{-c}\sqrt{N}\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt[4]{N}\log(N)\right) \quad (31)$$

which is minimized by $c = \mathcal{O}(\log\sqrt[4]{N})$.

In the quantum memory case only one sample is required from time step $t-1$ to time step t in order to achieve the same success probability, thus the memory requirement is logarithmically smaller (only $\lceil\log N\rceil$ qubits are needed to store a single copy of π_{t-1}). Regarding preparation speed, the quantum-memory algorithm is faster only by a logarithmic factor: they respectively run in time $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt[4]{N}(\log N)^{k+1}\sqrt{\delta_t^{-1}})$ and $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt[4]{N}(\log N)^k\sqrt{\delta_t^{-1}})$, for some constant $k \geq 0$ ¹⁹, and assuming a constant approximation error ε . In Appendix C we moreover show that all state preparation algorithms based on reflectors around $|\pi\rangle$ require $\Omega(\sqrt[4]{N})$ reflections to succeed; thus, no substantial improvement using this class of algorithms can be expected. This in particular means that only a very small advantage is obtained by utilizing quantum memory rather than classical memory alone.

IV. SEARCH AND UN-SEARCH FROM MARKED ELEMENTS

In this section we will analyse a modification of the classical-memory state preparation algorithm, presented in the previous sections, which is particularly useful in the context of quantization of rPS [11]. Specifically, in this context samples are not taken from the stationary distribution π but rather from the restriction of the distribution on a specific subset of marked elements $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$. This subset of marked elements could correspond to the entire set of *actions* that the agent can perform; or it could correspond to a *subset* of the actions, for instance those that have been rewarded in previous interactions with the external environment. Therefore the set of marked elements \mathcal{M} could, in principle, vary between successive steps in the sequence of slowly evolving MCs, but for sake of simplicity we will not discuss this possibility.

Typically we consider cases in which the number of marked elements $M = |\mathcal{M}|$ is much smaller than N , the total number of states. For completeness, we mention that we assume that the action set is either specified by a *membership oracle* $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{M}}$ or by a *sparse oracle* $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{M}}$. The former, given an element x , returns a flag specifying whether $x \in \mathcal{M}$ or not; the latter is a quantum accessible memory that, upon input of a number $\nu \in \{1, \dots, M\}$, outputs the ν -th element of \mathcal{M} (i.e. some $x_\nu \in \mathcal{M}$) in a given order.

We denote with $\pi^{\mathcal{M}}$ the (normalized) probability distribution obtained by restricting π to a subset \mathcal{M} . Namely, its elements are given as

$$\pi^{\mathcal{M}}(x) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\mu} \pi(x) & \text{if } x \in \mathcal{M} \\ 0 & \text{if } x \notin \mathcal{M} \end{cases}, \quad (32)$$

where $\mu := \sum_{x \in \mathcal{M}} \pi(x)$ is the probability of extracting an action when sampling from π , and the corresponding coherent encoding is

$$|\pi^{\mathcal{M}}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\mu}} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{M}} \sqrt{\pi(x)} |x\rangle. \quad (33)$$

¹⁹ From the analysis in Appendix A and restoring the $\log(N)$ factors hidden by the $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}$ notation one discovers that here $k = 1$.

The cost of sampling from $\pi^{\mathcal{M}}$ with the quantum algorithm given in [11] scales as $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\sqrt{\delta^{-1}}\sqrt{\mu^{-1}})$, representing a quadratic improvement in both *mixing time* and *hitting time* with respect to the classical MCMC method. These quadratic speed-ups can be achieved, however, *only when an initial copy of $|\pi\rangle$ is available*. Thus it is crucial to provide algorithms for preparing the quantum state $|\pi\rangle$ which are as efficient as possible.

Using the tools thus far introduced the description of the algorithm of [11] is very straightforward. Notice that with $O(1)$ accesses to the membership oracle are sufficient to implement reflectors around the \mathcal{M} subspace; and using Szegedy quantum walk $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\sqrt{\delta^{-1}})$ operations are required to implement an approximate reflector around the \mathcal{M} subspace (encoding the marked elements). This means that we can use FPAA to approximately project a initial copy of $|\pi\rangle$ onto te \mathcal{M} subspace, obtaining $|\pi_{\mathcal{M}}\rangle$. The operation requires $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\mu^{-1}})$ reflectors and the total runtime is thus $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\sqrt{\delta^{-1}}\sqrt{\mu^{-1}})$ as claimed²⁰. In conclusion samples from $\pi^{\mathcal{M}}$ can be (efficiently) obtained provided that we are also capable of producing copies of $|\pi\rangle$.

In the next section we show how to use again the idea of *un-searching* to re-prepare either the state $|\pi\rangle$, or the state $|\pi^{\mathcal{M}}\rangle$, having at hand these classical samples *from the marked elements subset*.

A. Preparing $|\pi\rangle$ or $|\pi^{\mathcal{M}}\rangle$ from marked elements

Here we show how a modification of the state preparation algorithms, based upon the idea of *un-searching* from the subset of marked element, can be more efficient in preparing $|\pi\rangle$ in some situations. Namely, the new strategy is more efficient whenever we have $\sqrt{\mu^{-1}}C(\pi^{\mathcal{M}}) < C(\pi)$, where $C(\pi^{\mathcal{M}})$ is defined as in Eq. (23). Since $|\pi^{\mathcal{M}}\rangle$ has support on just M elements, the bound $C(\pi^{\mathcal{M}}) \leq \sqrt[4]{M}$ ensues.

Subroutine 6 (Preparation of $|\pi\rangle$ from marked elements). *We suppose that the input to the algorithm are either the uniform distribution over the marked elements $\mathbf{u}^{\mathcal{M}}$ or samples drawn from $\pi_{t-1}^{\mathcal{M}}$. The samples from $\pi_{t-1}^{\mathcal{M}}$ are obtained running the algorithm of [11].*

Apart from using these different input states, the algorithms will work exactly as those presented in Sec III. We only have to ensure that the new input state can be efficiently prepared. This is obviously true for classical samples, while $\mathbf{u}^{\mathcal{M}}$ can be prepared with one access to the $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{M}}$ oracle:

$$|\mathbf{u}^{\mathcal{M}}\rangle = \mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{M}} \sum_{\nu=1}^M \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} |\nu\rangle. \quad (34)$$

*This is also sufficient for implement reflectors around $|\mathbf{u}^{\mathcal{M}}\rangle$ and $|x\rangle$ and thus also the *DeterministicProjector* subroutine.*

We can thus analyse the runtimes entailed by these different ansätze for the input states. Since the high-level description of the algorithms are unmodified, the only difference in runtime arises from the value of the overlap between the input and output states.

In the case of preparation from uniform the runtime scales as

$$|\langle \mathbf{u}^{\mathcal{M}} | \pi \rangle|^{-1} = \left(\sum_{x \in \mathcal{M}} \frac{\sqrt{\mu}}{\sqrt{M}} \sqrt{\pi^{\mathcal{M}}(x)} \right)^{-1} = \sqrt{\mu^{-1}} \frac{\sqrt{M}}{\|\pi^{\mathcal{M}}\|_{1/2}^{1/2}}, \quad (35)$$

while the expectation value of the runtime, when starting from a sample distributed as $\pi^{\mathcal{M}}$, is proportional to

$$\mathbb{E}_{x \sim \pi^{\mathcal{M}}} \left[|\langle x | \pi \rangle|^{-1} \right] = \sum_{x \in \mathcal{M}} \pi^{\mathcal{M}}(x) (\mu \pi^{\mathcal{M}}(x))^{-1/2} = \sqrt{\mu^{-1}} \|\pi^{\mathcal{M}}\|_{1/2}^{1/2}. \quad (36)$$

In conclusion, the runtime of this new version of the state preparation algorithm is the same as before, but for replacing the expression $C(\pi)$ with $\sqrt{\mu^{-1}}C(\pi^{\mathcal{M}})$, wherever that expression appeared.

²⁰ In [11] actually FPAA is not used, but the end result is essentially the same.

Before concluding, we notice that in the context of quantization of rPS it must be the case that samples from $\pi^{\mathcal{M}}$ are produced efficiently, since these samples represent the actions that the agent will output to the environment. In particular, the quantum algorithm for sampling presented in [11] runs in $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{\delta^{-1}}\sqrt{\mu^{-1}})$, and this runtime must not be prohibitively high. Therefore the runtime for preparation of $|\pi\rangle$, which is in $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{\delta^{-1}}\sqrt{\mu^{-1}}C(\pi^{\mathcal{M}}))$ is also acceptable, provided that $C(\pi^{\mathcal{M}})$ is a constant. Since $C(\pi^{\mathcal{M}}) \leq \sqrt[4]{M}$, this condition is automatically satisfied if the number of marked elements is constant.

We consider, finally, a method for producing new copies of $|\pi^{\mathcal{M}}\rangle$, provided that c samples from $\pi^{\mathcal{M}}$ are already available. This can be done straightforwardly by running Subroutine 6, followed by FPAA in order to implement a deterministic projection onto the marked elements. As discussed previously, the first operation runs in $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{\delta^{-1}}\sqrt{\mu^{-1}}C(\pi^{\mathcal{M}}))$ and the second in $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{\delta^{-1}}\sqrt{\mu^{-1}})$, thus the former runtime dominates the cost of this protocol.

V. OPTIMALITY ANALYSIS OF THE ALGORITHM FOR QUANTUM STATE PREPARATION

In this section we discuss the optimality of our algorithms for preparation of samples drawn from π , the stationary distribution of an ergodic time-reversible MC, and the related problem of preparing the corresponding coherent encoding $|\pi\rangle$.

a. Argument from computational complexity classes To begin with, we remark that preparing coherent encoding of probability distributions is in general a difficult task, even when sampling from the given distribution can be done efficiently. For instance, consider a randomized algorithm that ends up giving out some outcome x with probability $\pi(x)$. We can construct a quantum circuit which is the “purification” of this classical randomized algorithm²¹; the resulting output state will have the form:

$$|\tilde{\pi}\rangle \equiv \sum_x \sqrt{\pi(x)} |x\rangle |\psi(x)\rangle \quad (37)$$

where $|\psi(x)\rangle$ are completely unspecified states, including unknown phases²². However, starting from the state $|\tilde{\pi}\rangle$ one cannot directly obtain $|\pi\rangle$ since there is no general method that allows one to “erase” the junk information contained in $|\psi(x)\rangle$.

If it was possible to generically produce coherent encodings $|\pi\rangle$ of efficiently samplable probability distributions π , then a result of Aharonov and Ta-Shma [29] shows that this would imply $\text{SZK} \subseteq \text{BQP}$, that is, Statistical Zero Knowledge problems could be solved in quantum polynomial time. For instance, this would allow to solve Graph Isomorphism in polynomial time²³. While the inclusion of SKZ in BQP is not impossible, it is expected that any such algorithm would exploit specific structures of the problems (e.g. graph-theoretic properties in Graph Isomorphism). The methods based on MC mixing we consider are agnostic to such problem structures, and thus it is highly unlikely that they can be used to generically solve all SZK problems.

In summary, it is unlikely that any quantum algorithm can prepare states $|\pi\rangle$ encoding stationary distributions of time-reversible Markov chains in $\text{polylog}(N)$ time, not even when the MC is rapidly mixing (i.e., when it mixes in $\text{polylog}(N)$ time).

b. Argument from the “inner product adversary” method We now consider the class of algorithms for preparation of $|\pi\rangle$ which are based on Szegedy quantum walk. More precisely, we consider the case where one utilizes access to an (approximate) reflector, $\text{Reflector}(\pi)$, rather than the underlying Markov chain P that generates it. For this special case, we can show strict optimality.

More precisely, the task at hand is that of duplicating an initial state $|\pi\rangle$ having moreover the ability to reflect over $|\pi\rangle$, considered as a sub-routine to which we have only oracular access. In Appendix C we show that in order to duplicate $|\pi\rangle$ one needs $\Omega(C(\pi))$ accesses to the reflection oracle; more generally, $\Omega(C(\pi)/c^2)$ accesses are needed to produce $c+1$ copies from c initial ones. The crux of the argument is the “inner product adversary” method developed in [38], which is an extension of the techniques used to prove optimality of

²¹ This can be done substituting every coin toss with probability p of getting “tail” and $1-p$ of getting “head” with a controlled dependence on a pure qubit in the state $\sqrt{p}|\text{head}\rangle + \sqrt{1-p}|\text{tail}\rangle$.

²² Tracing over the second register returns the classical mixture $\rho_{\pi} = \sum_x \pi(x) |x\rangle\langle x|$.

²³ In a recent breakthrough, a classical quasi-polynomial time algorithm for Graph Isomorphism has been found; but classical or quantum polynomial time algorithms for solving this task are not known.

Grover search. Briefly, the method shows that, on average, the distinguishability between two quantum states $|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle$ can only increase by a very small amount when accessing either a reflector around $|\psi_1\rangle$ or around $|\psi_2\rangle$. But if $|\langle\psi_2|\psi_1\rangle| = \eta$, then $|\langle\psi_2|^{\otimes 2}|\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes 2}| = \eta^2$, which is a large gap in distinguishability, when η is a constant different from 0 or 1.

Our classical- and quantum-memory algorithms succeed in preparing $|\pi\rangle$ using $\Omega(C(\pi))$ accesses to $\text{Ref}(\pi)$ and are, thus, asymptotically optimal. The same analysis applied to the task of preparing $|\pi^{\mathcal{M}}\rangle$ gives a $\Omega(C(\pi^{\mathcal{M}}))$ lower bound, which only misses the $\sqrt{\mu^{-1}}$ dependence in the runtime.

c. The case of classical samples It is critical to note that the two hardness results stated in this section apply only in the case one's aim is to produce coherent encodings $|\pi\rangle$. If the task is just that of producing samples from π the arguments given before do not apply.

Entirely new methods would be needed in order to provide lower bounds to the complexity of classical sampling problems. In the oracular setting, in which one has black-box access to either $\text{Ref}(\pi)$ or $\text{Ref}(\pi')$, it is possible that a $\Omega(N^{1/k})$ lower bound, for some constant $k \geq 4$, can be obtained. For instance, one could try to modify the “inner product adversary” method in order to keep track of the increase in statistical distinguishability between the output probability distributions of a quantum algorithm that has access to either reflection oracle.

In this work, however, we will not pursue further attempts to establish lower bounds for the classical output case, as it in fact does not fully capture the setting we are considering. Notice, in fact, that we have complete access to the Markov chain P , and thus we are not restricted to using accessing it only through $\text{Ref}(\pi)$. In particular, we can as well use access to P to implement a classical random walk. If the classical mixing time is fast (in $\text{polylog}(N)$ time) then, by definition, the random walk allows to efficiently sample from a probability distribution ε -close to π . Achieving the same goal, i.e. drawing classical samples from π , having access only to $\text{Ref}(\pi)$ and an initial copy of $|\pi\rangle$ could take exponentially longer time.

VI. DISCUSSION

We have presented quantum algorithms for sequentially generating stationary distributions of an arbitrarily long sequence of Markov chains. These quantum algorithms outperform classical approaches whenever the spectral gaps δ of the Markov chains are below $1/\sqrt{N}$, where N is the size of the state space. In contrast, straightforward application of the “mixing by reverse hitting” approach[37] would yield improvements only in a quadratically more stringent regime where $\delta < 1/N$. The basic observation we have used is that the bottle-neck of direct mixing by running hitting algorithms in reverse, can be ameliorated when a small number of elements sampled from the target distribution are available beforehand. We have shown that this can guarantee that the initial state of the unsearch approach is far from the worst case setting. Following this, we have shown how these samples can be made available in the context of slowly evolving Markov chains.

As we have clarified, the presented algorithms have an immediate application in a recent approach to (quantum) artificial intelligence [11], but they may be useful in other contexts as well. For instance, they may offer improvements for problems stemming from statistical physics. One application could be in the case when strictly independent samples from Gibbs distributions of physical systems are required in a large range of temperatures, which include the computationally difficult low-temperature regimes. Other applications may be possible as well, for instance in applications where subsequent Markov chains may depend on the actual outputs of previous mixing steps. In this case, quantum-enhanced classical annealing methods become unsuitable, as they need to keep coherence through the protocol steps [12, 13].

As a feature of our protocol, at each time step we do not output just a classical sample from the target stationary distribution, but a coherent encoding of this distribution. This is not a guaranteed characteristic of quantum mixing protocols [25], and makes our approach suitable for combining with other quantum protocols which start from such a coherent encoding [11, 20, 21, 28]. Moreover, we have shown that in general $\Omega(\sqrt[4]{N})$ reflectors are needed to re-prepare these coherent encodings, rendering our algorithms asymptotically optimal.

In the protocols we have presented, as in other related works, it is always assumed that aside from the Markov chains themselves, one also has access to the values of the spectral gaps. This is potentially a problematic assumption, since, at least in the general cases, spectral gaps are often difficult to determine. Consequently, methods which do not rely on good lower bounds of the spectral gaps, or, more precisely, which can adaptively estimate the changes in spectral gaps in the context of slowly evolving sequences, are part of ongoing work.

Acknowledgments: The authors acknowledge the support by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) through the

SFB FoQuS F4012, and the Templeton World Charity Foundation grant TWCF0078/AB46. VD thanks G. D. Paparo for initial discussions. DO thanks Francesco Guatieri for discussion.

Appendix A: Analysis of imperfect reflection operators

Here we consider the propagation of errors when the partial reflector over the stationary distribution, used within FPAA, are approximate.

Suppose that χ is (a lower bound to) the fidelity between the initial state and the target state and the final targeted error is ε . FPAA entails the use of $\mathcal{O}(\chi \log \varepsilon^{-1})$ perfect reflectors in order to achieve the desired accuracy goal. However, the same can be achieved with imperfect reflectors, provided that each reflector has an error smaller of $\varepsilon/(\text{number of steps})$: by the triangle inequality the total accumulated error will be upper bounded by $\mathcal{O}(\varepsilon)$. That is, we need to implement **Reflector** with an accuracy

$$\varepsilon^{\text{Ref}} = \Omega\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{\chi \log \varepsilon^{-1}}\right); \quad (\text{A1})$$

hence the total cost of the **DeterministicProjector** procedure (nesting approximate reflectors within FPAA) is given with:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{O}(\chi \log \varepsilon^{-1}) \times \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\delta^{-1}} \log(1/\varepsilon^{\text{Ref}})) \\ &= \mathcal{O}\left(\chi \sqrt{\delta^{-1}} \log(\varepsilon^{-1}) [\log \chi + \log \varepsilon^{-1} + \log \log \varepsilon^{-1}]\right) \\ &= \tilde{\mathcal{O}}\left(\chi \sqrt{\delta^{-1}} \log^2(\varepsilon^{-1})\right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A2})$$

Thus, the precision of the approximation contributes only logarithmically in the overall complexity, even in the iterated setting.

Appendix B: Failure probabilities of preparation from uniform and from samples

We must make sure that the inductive steps of our protocol, going from one time step to another, are not overly sensitive to small imperfections.

For **PrepareFromUniform**, as given in Algorithm 1, the analysis is simple, since the input state $|\mathbf{u}\rangle$ has no error. The algorithm succeeds when at least c of $2c$ applications of $\text{DeterministicProjector}_{\varepsilon, 1/\chi'}^{\text{flag}}$ are successful. In the case in which $\chi' \geq \sqrt{N}/\|\pi\|_{1/2}^{1/2}$ the global probability of failure is $2^{-\mathcal{O}(c)}$. In fact the $2c$ runs have independent outcomes; then, we can apply the Chernoff bound:

$$\Pr[\text{number of failures} \geq (1 + \delta) 2\varepsilon c] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\delta^2}{2 + \delta} 2\varepsilon c\right) \quad (\text{B1})$$

where ε is an upper bound to the failure probability of **DeterministicProjector** and $\delta > 0$ is a free parameter. Choosing $1 + \delta = 1/(2\varepsilon)$ we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr[\text{number of failures} \geq c] &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{(1 - 2\varepsilon)^2}{1 + 2\varepsilon} c\right) \\ &\leq \exp(-0.9 c), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B2})$$

where the second inequality holds for sufficiently small ε .

A similar analysis holds for **PrepareFromSamples**, as given in Algorithm 1. Notice that the input samples $\vec{x} = \{x_1, \dots, x_c\}$ are not (exactly) distributed with π , but with a distribution $\tilde{\pi}$ which is ε -close to π , say, in

total variation distance. Considering a random variable \tilde{X} distributed as $\tilde{\pi}$ we have, for any $v > 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \left[\pi^{-1/2}(\tilde{X}) \geq v \right] &= \sum_{x: \pi^{-1/2}(x) \geq v} \tilde{\pi}(x) \\ &\leq \varepsilon + \sum_{x: \pi^{-1/2}(x) \geq v} \pi(x) \\ &= \varepsilon + \Pr \left[\pi^{-1/2}(X) \geq v \right] \\ &\leq \varepsilon + \frac{\mathbb{E}[\pi^{-1/2}(X)]}{v}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B3})$$

In the first inequality we have applied the definition of total variation distance and in the second Markov's inequality. Thus, we have

$$\Pr \left[\pi^{-1/2}(\tilde{X}) \geq 2 \mathbb{E}[\pi^{-1/2}(X)] \right] \leq \varepsilon + \frac{1}{2}. \quad (\text{B4})$$

Thus, with high probability at least one sample in $x_* \in \vec{x}$ satisfies $\pi^{-1/2}(x_*) < 2 \mathbb{E}[\pi^{-1/2}(X)] = 2 \|\pi\|_{1/2}^{1/2}$; namely, this happens with probability at least:

$$1 - \left(\frac{1 + 2\varepsilon}{2} \right)^c = 1 - 2^{-\mathcal{O}(c)}. \quad (\text{B5})$$

Then, we run $\text{DeterministicProjector}_{\varepsilon, 1/(2\chi)}^{\text{flag}}(x_*, \pi)$ for $2c$ times. If $\chi \geq \|\pi\|_{1/2}^{1/2}$ the analysis proceeds exactly as the one performed for $\text{PrepareFromUniform}$ and, hence, with probability $1 - 2^{-\mathcal{O}(c)}$ at least c of these $2c$ runs will be successful in producing approximations of $|\pi\rangle$. The global failure probability of $\text{PrepareFromSamples}$ is thus in $2^{-\mathcal{O}(c)}$.

Finally, the algorithms $\text{PrepareFromUniform}$ and $\text{PrepareFromSamples}$ are used as subroutines of the classical-memory state preparation algorithm, as specified in Algorithm 3 and 4. In this algorithm the values of χ and $\chi' = \sqrt{N}/\chi$ are doubled until they exceed $\sqrt[4]{N}$, in which case either $\chi \geq \|\pi\|_{1/2}^{1/2}$ or $\chi' \geq \sqrt[4]{N}/\|\pi\|_{1/2}^{1/2}$ is satisfied, in which case the algorithm has to succeed, except with probability $2^{-\mathcal{O}(c)}$. This is, thus, the global failure probability of the entire classical-memory state preparation algorithm.

We finally remark, again, that errors do not propagate from one time step to the next, since at each time step we freshly prepare new copies of the relevant states. This is possible since we have access to projectors onto the required states, which thus allow to decrease approximation errors.

Appendix C: Lower bound on preparation of states with positive amplitudes

The state preparation algorithms presented in this work allow us to prepare $|\pi\rangle$ using $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\sqrt[4]{N})$ reflectors around $|\pi\rangle$ (for a constant target precision ε), using at most logarithmically many copies of $|\pi\rangle$. One of the results of [38] by Aaronson and Christiano is that there exist a class of states with all positive real amplitudes (effectively, coherent encodings of probability distributions) which require, on average, $\Omega(\sqrt[4]{N})$ accesses to the reflection oracle in order to be duplicated. This already show that our algorithms have essentially optimal worst case performance.

Here, we strengthen the result in the following way. We show that, in order to prepare a new copy of $|\pi\rangle$ given c initial copies of the same state, a number of oracle accesses to a reflector around $|\pi\rangle$ which scales as $\Omega(C(\pi)/c^2)$ are required. This means that our algorithm are asymptotically optimal (up to logarithmic factors) in the number of queries to a reflection oracle that are required to prepare one more copy of the state $|\pi\rangle$, for any value of the parameter $C(\pi)$.

To prove our lower bound, we use the inner-product adversary method presented in [38]. We can condense the results of Section 4.2 and Appendix B of [38] into the following theorem.

Theorem 1. *Suppose that we have access to reflection oracles U_ψ (and to their controlled versions) such that:*

$$\begin{aligned} U_\psi |\psi\rangle &= -|\psi\rangle \\ U_\psi |\eta\rangle &= +|\eta\rangle \quad \forall |\eta\rangle \text{ orthogonal to } |\psi\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C1})$$

The states $|\psi\rangle$ come from a subset \mathcal{Z} of the entire Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . Moreover we require that on these state there is a symmetric binary relation $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{Z}$ such that:

$$\forall (\psi, \phi) \in \mathcal{R} \implies |\langle \psi | \phi \rangle| = a \quad (\text{C2})$$

for some positive constant a . Suppose, next, that for all $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{Z}$ and for all $|\eta\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$ that are orthogonal to $|\psi\rangle$ the following inequality holds

$$\mathbb{E}_{\substack{\phi \in \mathcal{Z}: \\ (\psi, \phi) \in \mathcal{R}}} \left[|\langle \eta | \phi \rangle|^2 \right] \leq \gamma \quad (\text{C3})$$

for some $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Then, given c copies of an unknown state $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{Z}$ one needs

$$\Omega \left(\frac{a^c - a^{c+1}}{\sqrt{\gamma}} \right) \quad (\text{C4})$$

accesses to a controlled- U_ψ in order to end up with $c+1$ perfect copies of $|\psi\rangle$. In particular, setting $a = 1 - 1/c$, the expression above gives a lower bound to the required number of oracle queries which is $\Omega \left(\frac{1}{c\sqrt{\gamma}} \right)$.

To apply the theorem in our case, we will take the total Hilbert space to be $\mathcal{H} = \text{span}(\{|x\rangle \mid x \in [N]\})$. The set \mathcal{Z} will consist of all states of the form

$$|\mathbf{u}_S\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{K}} \sum_{x \in S} |x\rangle \quad (\text{C5})$$

where $S \subseteq [N]$ is a subset containing $K < N$ elements. These states are proper coherent encodings of probability distributions. Two states $|\mathbf{u}_S\rangle, |\mathbf{u}_{S'}\rangle$ are in relation \mathcal{R} iff

$$\langle \mathbf{u}_S | \mathbf{u}_{S'} \rangle = a \iff |S \cap S'| = aK \quad (\text{C6})$$

We need to prove that $\forall S \subseteq [N]$ with $|S| = K$, $\forall |\eta\rangle$ orthogonal to $|\mathbf{u}_S\rangle$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\substack{S': |S'|=K \\ |S \cap S'|=aK}} \left[|\langle \eta | \mathbf{u}_{S'} \rangle|^2 \right] \leq \gamma \quad (\text{C7})$$

Exploiting the theorem given above this allows us to prove a lower bound to the number of queries necessary to produce one more copy of a state $|\mathbf{u}_S\rangle$. Let us then provide a proper upper bound γ .

Proof. First, notice that $|\eta\rangle = \sum_x \eta_x |x\rangle$ is orthogonal to $|\mathbf{u}_S\rangle$, hence $\sum_{x \in S} \eta_x = 0$. Then we expand:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\substack{S': |S'|=K \\ |S \cap S'|=aK}} \left[|\langle \eta | \mathbf{u}_{S'} \rangle|^2 \right] &= \mathbb{E}_{\substack{S': |S'|=K \\ |S \cap S'|=aK}} \left[\left| \sum_{i \in S'} \frac{\eta_i}{\sqrt{K}} \right|^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{K} \mathbb{E}_{\substack{S': |S'|=K \\ |S \cap S'|=aK}} \left[\sum_{i \in S'} \sum_{j \in S'} \eta_i^* \eta_j \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C8})$$

Next, we split the sum over elements in S' as sum of elements in $S' \cap S$ and elements in $S' \setminus S$:

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{C8}) &= \frac{1}{K} \mathbb{E}_{\substack{S': |S'|=K \\ |S \cap S'|=aK}} \left[\sum_{i \in S'} \sum_{j \in S'} \eta_i^* \eta_j \right] = \\ &= \frac{1}{K} \mathbb{E}_{\substack{S': |S'|=K \\ |S \cap S'|=aK}} \left[\sum_{i \in S' \cap S} \sum_{j \in S' \cap S} \eta_i^* \eta_j + \sum_{i \in S' \setminus S} \sum_{j \in S' \setminus S} \eta_i^* \eta_j + \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{i \in S' \cap S} \sum_{j \in S' \setminus S} (\eta_i^* \eta_j + \eta_j^* \eta_i) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C9})$$

The first term in the sum in Eq. (C9) evaluates to

$$\mathbb{E}_{\substack{I \subseteq S: \\ |I|=aK}} \left[\sum_{i \in I} \sum_{j \in I} \eta_i^* \eta_j \right] = a \sum_{i \in S} |\eta_i|^2 + \frac{aK(aK-1)}{K(K-1)} \sum_{\substack{i, j \in S \\ i \neq j}} \eta_i^* \eta_j \quad (\text{C10})$$

and the second term in the sum evaluates to

$$\mathbb{E}_{\substack{I \subseteq S^c: \\ |I|=(1-a)K}} \left[\sum_{i \in I} \sum_{j \in I} \eta_i^* \eta_j \right] = \frac{(1-a)K}{N-K} \sum_{i \in S^c} |\eta_i|^2 + \frac{(1-a)K[(1-a)K-1]}{(N-K)(N-K-1)} \sum_{\substack{i, j \in S^c \\ i \neq j}} \eta_i^* \eta_j \quad (\text{C11})$$

while the third term evaluates to

$$\mathbb{E}_{\substack{S': |S'|=K \\ |S \cap S'|=aK}} \left[\sum_{i \in S' \cap S} \sum_{j \in S' \setminus S} (\eta_i^* \eta_j + \eta_j^* \eta_i) \right] = \frac{aK}{K} \frac{(1-a)K}{N-K} \sum_{\substack{i \in S \\ j \in S^c}} (\eta_i^* \eta_j + \eta_j^* \eta_i) \quad (\text{C12})$$

Then, plugging in the equation $\sum_{x \in S} \eta_x = 0$, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{C9}) &= \frac{a}{K} \sum_{i \in S} |\eta_i|^2 + \frac{1-a}{N-K} \left(\sum_{i \in S^c} |\eta_i|^2 + \frac{(1-a)K-1}{N-K-1} \sum_{\substack{i, j \in S^c \\ i \neq j}} \eta_i^* \eta_j \right) \\ &\leq \frac{a}{K} + \frac{1-a}{N-K} \left(1 + \frac{(1-a)K-1}{N-K-1} (N-K) \right) \\ &\leq \frac{a}{K} + \frac{1-a}{N-K} \left(1 + 2(1-a)K \right) \\ &\leq \frac{a}{K} + \frac{1-a}{N-K} 3(1-a)K \\ &\leq \frac{a}{K} + 6(1-a)^2 \frac{K}{N} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C13})$$

for appropriate choices of K (we have used respectively $K \leq N-2$, $K \geq 1/(1-a)$ and $K \leq N/2$ for the last three inequalities above). Then, we substitute $a = 1 - 1/c$, where c is the initial number of copies of the state $|\mathbf{u}_S\rangle$ that we want to clone, thus obtaining:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\substack{S': |S'|=K \\ |S \cap S'|=K-K/c}} \left[|\langle \eta | \mathbf{u}_{S'} \rangle|^2 \right] \leq \frac{1}{K} + 6c^2 \frac{K}{N} \equiv \gamma \quad (\text{C14})$$

Plugging this value of γ in the result of the theorem above gives the following lower bound on the number of queries required to the reflection oracle to prepare another copy of the state $|\mathbf{u}_S\rangle$:

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega\left(\frac{1}{c\sqrt{\gamma}}\right) &\geq \Omega\left(\min\left\{\frac{1}{c^2}\sqrt{\frac{N}{K}}, \frac{1}{c}\sqrt{K}\right\}\right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{c^2} \Omega\left(\min\left\{\frac{\sqrt{N}}{\|\mathbf{u}_S\|_{1/2}^{1/2}}, \|\mathbf{u}_S\|_{1/2}^{1/2}\right\}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{c^2} \Omega(C(\mathbf{u}_S)) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C15})$$

□

The theorem given above shows that $\mathcal{O}(C(\pi))$ accesses to a reflector around $|\pi\rangle$ are needed in order to exactly duplicate $|\pi\rangle$. Using the results of Corollary 5.3 and 5.4 of [38] the same $\mathcal{O}(C(\pi))$ lower bound applies for preparation of $|\pi\rangle^{\otimes(c+1)}$ within constant approximation error.

- [2] Ambainis, A., Bach, E., Nayak, A., Vishwanath, A. and Watrous, J., *One-dimensional quantum walks*. *Proceedings of the Thirty-third Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, 37–49 (2001).
- [3] Aharonov, D., Ambainis, A., Kempe, J. and Vazirani, U., *Quantum walks on graphs*. *Proceedings of the Thirty-third Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, 50–59 (2001) [arXiv:0012090].
- [4] Moore, C. and Russell, A., *Quantum Walks on the Hypercube*. *Randomization and Approximation Techniques in Computer Science* **2483**, 164–178 (2002) [arXiv:0104137].
- [5] Szegedy, M., *Quantum speed-up of markov chain based algorithms*. *45th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, 32–41 (2004).
- [6] Kempe, J., *Quantum random walks - an introductory overview*. *Contemp. Phys.* **44**(4), 307–327 (2003) [arXiv:0303081].
- [7] Reitzner, D., Nagaj, D. and Bužek, V., *Quantum Walks*. *Acta Phys. Slovaca* **61**(6), 603–725 (2011) [arXiv:1207.7283].
- [8] Temme, K., Osborne, T. J., Vollbrecht, K. G. H., Poulin, D. and Verstraete, F., *Quantum metropolis sampling*. *Nature* **471**, 87–90 (2011), [arXiv:0911.3635].
- [9] Yung, M.-H. and Aspuru-Guzik, A., *A quantum-quantum metropolis algorithm*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **109**(3), 754–759 (2012) [arXiv:1011.1468].
- [10] Somma, R. D., Boixo, S., Barnum, H. and Knill, E., *Quantum simulations of classical annealing processes*. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 130504 (2008) [arXiv:0804.1571].
- [11] Paparo, G. D., Dunjko, V., Makmal, A., Matrin-Delgado, M. A. and Briegel, H. J., *Quantum speedup for active learning agents*. *Phys. Rev. X* **4**, 031002 (2014) [arXiv:1401.4997].
- [12] Wocjan, P. and Abeyesinghe, A., *Speedup via quantum sampling*. *Phys. Rev. A* **78**, 042336 (2008) [arXiv:0804.4259].
- [13] Wocjan, P., Chiang, C., Nagaj, D. and Abeyesinghe, A., *Quantum algorithm for approximating partition functions*. *Phys. Rev. A* **80**, 022340 (2009) [arXiv:1405.2749].
- [14] Sutton, R. S. & Barto, A. G. *Reinforcement learning: An introduction* (MIT Press, Cambridge Massachusetts, 1998), first edn.
- [15] Briegel, H. J. and De las Cuevas, G., *Projective simulation for artificial intelligence*. *Sci. Rep.* **2**, 400 (2012).
- [16] Mautner, J., Makmal, A., Manzano, D., Tiersch, M. and Briegel, H. J., *Projective simulation for classical learning agents: a comprehensive investigation*. *New Generat. Comput.* **33**(1), 69–114 (2015) [arXiv:1305.1578].
- [17] Dunjko, V. and Briegel, H. J., *Machine learning & artificial intelligence in the quantum domain*. [arXiv:quant-ph/1709.02779](https://arxiv.org/abs/1709.02779) (2017).
- [18] Ambainis, A., *Quantum walk algorithms for element distinctness*. *SIAM Journal on Computing* **37**(1), 22–31 (2004) [arXiv:0311001].
- [19] Magniez, F., Santha, M. and Szegedy, M., *Quantum Algorithms for the Triangle Problem*. *SIAM Journal on Computing* **37**(2), 413–424 (2007) [arXiv:0310134].
- [20] Krovi, H., Magniez, F., Ozols, M. and Roland, J., *Quantum walks can find a marked element on any graph*. *Algorithmica* **74**(2), 851–907 (2016) [arXiv:1002.2419].
- [21] Magniez, F., Nayak, A., Roland, J. and Santha, M., *Search via quantum walk*. *SIAM Journal on Computing* **40**(1), 142–164 (2011) [arXiv:0608026].
- [22] Aldous, D., László, L. and Winkler, P., *Mixing times for uniformly ergodic Markov chains*. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* **71**(2), 165–182 (1995).
- [23] Norris, J. R., *Markov chains*, Cambridge University Press (1998).
- [24] Levin, D. A. and Peres, Y., *Markov chains and mixing times* American Mathematical Soc. (2017).
- [25] Richter, P. C., *Quantum speedup of classical mixing processes*. *Phys. Rev. A* **76**, 042306 (2007) [arXiv:0609204].
- [26] Richter, P. C., *Almost uniform sampling via quantum walks*. *New J. Phys.* **9**(72), (2007) [arXiv:0606202].
- [27] Dunjko, V. and Briegel, H. J., *Quantum mixing of Markov chains for special distributions*. *New J. Phys.* **17**(7), 073004 (2015) [arXiv:1502.05511].
- [28] Montanaro, A., *Quantum speedup of Monte Carlo methods*. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A* **471**(2181), 0301 (2015) [arXiv:1504.06987].
- [29] Aharonov, D. and Ta-Shma, A., *Adiabatic Quantum State Generation and Statistical Zero Knowledge*. *Proceedings of the thirty-fifth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, 20–29 (2003) [arXiv:0301023].
- [30] Grover, L. K., *A fast quantum mechanical algorithm for database search*. *Proceedings of the 28th Annual ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing (STOC)*, 212–219 (1996) [arXiv:9605043].
- [31] Brassard, G., Hoyer, P., Mosca, M. and Tapp, A., *Quantum Amplitude Amplification and Estimation*. *Contemporary Mathematics* **305**, 53–74 (2002) [arXiv:0005055].
- [32] Grover, L. K., *Fixed-Point Quantum Search*. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 150501 (2005) [arXiv:0503205].
- [33] Yoder, T. J., Low, G. H. and Chuang, I. L., *Fixed-Point Quantum Search with an Optimal Number of Queries*. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 210501 (2014)
- [34] Kitaev, A. Y., *Quantum measurements and the Abelian Stabilizer Problem*. *Electronic Colloquium on Computational Complexity* **3** (1996) [arXiv:9511026].
- [35] Svore, K. M., Hastings, M. B. and Freedman, M., *Faster Phase Estimation*. *Quantum Information & Computation* **14**(3-4), 306–328 (2014) [arXiv:1304.0741].
- [36] Wiebe, N. and Granade, C. E., *Efficient Bayesian Phase Estimation* *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, 010503 (2016) [arXiv:1508.00869]

- [37] Childs, A. *Quantum information processing in continuous time*. Ph. D. Thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (2004).
- [38] Aaronson, S. and Christiano, P., *Quantum Money from Hidden Subspaces*. *Theory of Computing* **9(9)**, 349-401 (2013) [[arXiv:1203.4740](#)].